

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET
FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

JULY, 1914

"Swedenborg the Mystic": Is Emerson's Characterization Correct?	JOHN GODDARD	321
Emerson the Critic.	HORATIO W. DRESSER, PH.D.	338
Doctrine and Experience.	WILLIAM F. WUNSCH	342
Two Functions of the Church.	JAMES REED	357
New-Church Propaganda.	WALTER B. MURRAY	367
The Relation of Man and Woman.	E. M. LAWRENCE GOULD	382
Do We Need a New Gospel? An Examination of Churchill's "Inside of the Cup."	FRANK SEWALL	396
The Word as a Whole: V. The Revelation.	PAUL SPERRY	406
"The Worship and Love of God." [A Review.]	FRANK W. VERY	414
Editorial Department:		429
Christian Unity; The 94th Session of the General Convention.		
Biblical and Doctrinal Studies:		445
The Tribe of Levi; The Lord's Physical and Resurrection Body.		
Current Literature:		460
Maclagan's Book of Numbers Explained; Paterson-Smyth's "Bible in the Making"; Dobschütz's "Influence of the Bible on Civilization"; Martin Luther's Correspondence; Whitelaw's "Jehovah-Jesus"; Fosdick's "Assurance of Immortality."		

BOSTON:

THE MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION
134 BOWDOIN STREET.

50 CENTS A COPY. ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. \$2.00 A YEAR
(POSTAGE TO CANADA 12 CENTS, AND TO EUROPE 25 CENTS EXTRA PER ANNUM.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter

The New-Church Review

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW is the lineal descendant of the *New-Jerusalem Magazine*, which was established as a monthly periodical in 1827. In 1893 it was believed that a quarterly review of the progress of the church and the world, allowing for longer articles and a more comprehensive treatment of subjects, would be of greater service. The form was therefore changed and a characteristic title adopted. The field to be covered has been the same for this long period now approaching a century, but greatly changed and ever changing more swiftly. The light in which it is viewed is from the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, unfolding as they do the spiritual meaning of the Holy Scriptures and fulfilling the prophecy of the Lord's second coming to save mankind.

The REVIEW is seeking to set forth these principles, which are represented in the closing chapters of the Word by the symbolic New Jerusalem, descending from God out of heaven to a new earth (Rev. xxi, 1, 2). It is endeavoring to show their application not only to the organized New Church but also to the world in this period of transition and upheaval that is ushering in a "new era" of thought and life. In this effort it has been supported by able writers both in this country and abroad; and with such success as to call forth warm commendations.

The Board of Editors, as now organized, consists of the Rev. H. Clinton Hay as managing editor, and of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite and Mr. B. A. Whittemore; with the Rev. James Reed in an advisory capacity.

\$2.00 A YEAR. SINGLE NUMBERS 50 CENTS.

Postage to Canada 12 cents, and to Europe 25 cents extra per annum.

The Massachusetts New-Church Union

143 Bowdoin Street,

-

-

-

-

Boston

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXI.]

JULY, 1914

[No. 3.]

"SWEDENBORG THE MYSTIC": IS EMERSON'S CHARACTERIZATION CORRECT?

IN his volume entitled "Representative Men," Ralph Waldo Emerson devotes one chapter to "Swedenborg the Mystic." The writer selects certain men as representatives of classes of ideas theoretical or practical; thus Plato stands for the Philosopher, Montaigne for the Sceptic, Napoleon for the Man of the World, etc. Thus Swedenborg is presented as the arch-representative of Mysticism, its high priest and expositor.

Whether chiefly due to Emerson's influence or not, it is certain that his characterization of Swedenborg has been largely adopted by thinking men, and since the tendency of such a designation is to lead the investigating mind astray, it has seemed worth while to indicate the error, and to do all that is possible to prepare the way for a truer conception of the work of this most wonderful of modern men. If "a rose by any other name would smell as sweet," it is because its quality is unmistakable, and because it leaves no room for mystery about it. It is important that the leaders of thought should be correctly named. There may be no better name for Swedenborg than that which he places on the title page of his latest works—"Servant of the Lord Jesus Christ." But it may help to clarify our conceptions and strengthen our faith, if we can see with some clearness, that the title "Mystic," applied to Swedenborg, not only fails to describe, but in most respects stands in direct opposition to his whole life and mission.

Let us then briefly examine some of the leading definitions of the Mystic and Mysticism, contrasting them with equal brevity with well-known facts of Swedenborg's life and teachings, and then, glancing at the outlines of his life as a whole, contrast its underlying spirit and purpose with that of the mystics.

The Mystic, then, has been defined as one who holds to the possibility of a direct consciousness of or converse with God by a species of ecstasy (Century Dictionary).

While Swedenborg declares his ability to perceive, at least at times, the inflow of mental states from spirits and angels, and to distinguish between these and the influences which came directly from the Lord, yet his own freedom and rationality were always perfectly preserved. He speaks of ecstasy, but declares that it was not his own state. And not only in his mental perceptions was he always himself, but in the opening of the senses of his spiritual body to the realities of the inner world, his condition was one of complete wakefulness; and it was unlike the state of any other person who has ever had such open vision in this respect, that he could live in both worlds at the same time. The consciousness of the spiritual world did not shut out the consciousness of the natural. His feet rested always on the earth. Even his most exalted thoughts are embodied in earthly language, and enforced by earthly illustration. The two worlds in him are in touch with each other. There is no ecstasy, no dreaming, when once he is ready for his mission. He is always himself, always calm, always reasonable.

The Mystic is also defined as one who professes direct Divine illumination, or relies chiefly upon meditation and intuition in acquiring truth (Standard Dictionary).

Here we have a double definition. As to direct Divine illumination, while Swedenborg acknowledges the fact of such illumination, yet it was never a substitute for his own effort, will, or reason. It came to him gradually, through years of preparation. His own freedom was consulted at every step. While we cannot assert that his illumination was bounded by or limited to his state of regeneration, (for

his work was not merely individual or personal, but universal), yet he tells us that an illumination, presumably similar to his own, although necessarily limited in scope, can be enjoyed by all who are in a state of charity and faith.

As to his intuition, while he doubtless possessed this faculty to a supereminent degree, yet he was never wholly dependent upon it. Never for one moment did he yield to the temptation to follow the course of the Oriental Mystic, and separate himself from the world. His illumination and intuition followed almost forty years of earthly study and rational investigation. Meditation, in the sense of careful reflection, was his habit, but not outside of facts, or of reason, or of practical life. While his spiritual mission required him at last to resign his office of Assessor of Mines, he never left his work in the House of Nobles, remaining active in that duty until the close of his life. He did not, then, "rely chiefly upon meditation and intuition," but upon facts.

Mysticism has also been defined as the effort of the mind to grasp the Divine essence, or the ultimate reality of things, and to enjoy the blessedness of actual communion with the Highest. "The thought most intensely present with the Mystic" (we read) "is that of a supreme, all-pervading Power, in whom all things are one. Hence, the speculative utterances of mystics are always more or less pantheistic in character" (*Encyclopedia Britannica*).

We may reply first, that Swedenborg was not seeking to enjoy blessedness, but to find the truth, wherever it might lead; and secondly, that so far from pantheistic tendencies, that is, the disposition to regard the creature and the Creator as one and the same, the ever-present and vital thought of Swedenborg everywhere is the eternal distinction, the great and impassable gulf between Life itself and its receptacles. He alone among theologians or philosophers furnishes a rational clue to this distinction in the doctrine of "discrete degrees." Nothing is quite so offensive (not to say horrible) to him as the confusion of the essence of God and man, which he condemns in the severest terms. His thought closes the door

forever against the pantheistic conceptions of the Orient or the Occident. The higher the angel, the more conscious he is of his own freedom, rationality and personality, and at the same time the more conscious is he of the truth that the Lord alone is Life. The greatest in the Kingdom is not he who claims to be a part of God, but he who has become as a little child.

Mysticism has also been defined as involving an immediate and continuous communication between God and the soul, which may be established by means of certain peculiar religious exercises, such as a belief in an inner light, a contemplation of the Divine, which may almost dispense with the need of a written revelation (*Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*).

We are all aware how this state of mind and the practices leading to it are condemned by Swedenborg, how solemn his warnings against them, and how, in contrast, the written revelation or the Word of God was his constant study, and the Source of the doctrines which he gave to the world, and how he points his readers to that Source.

Here we pause in our search for specific definitions of the mystic, and of mysticism. There is, however, one other and broader use of the word "mysticism" which has become quite common, and which we cannot pass by.

Whenever the churches have tended to lose the consciousness of God, either through the emphasis laid upon outward forms and ceremonies, or through the crystallization of living doctrines into fixed dogmas, so that they are made the test of faith, or through the claim of ecclesiastical authority, suppressing reason, there has always (we are reminded) been more or less of a reaction, either through the appearance of individuals who have felt the need of restoring the balance between the visible and the invisible church, or else through the upbuilding, as in the Protestant branch, of sects which have emphasized the same necessity of a living spiritual experience in place of formalism, dogma, or authority. And this tendency has not been confined to Christianity. We are reminded, for example, that out of Jewish formalism, crys-

tallized in the Talmud, arose the Kabala, with its occult symbolism, and pantheistic philosophy; out of the ossified externalism of Brahmanism developed Buddhism as a reaction and protest. Out of the Mohammedan Koran worship grew the Persian Sufism. All of these sought in their way to restore the spirit and life of religion lost through emotional formalism, or dead intellectualism, or stupefying ecclesiastical control. And so in the Christian church.

With Romanists the spirit of mysticism has appeared largely in individuals rather than in sects or systems. Paul Sabatier, in his work on "Modernism," supplies a reason, when he describes the Catholic horror of schism. And yet the Neo-Platonic school, while not schismatic, represented the mystical tendency in the church. But its special development was individual, for Rome, which has always realized the power of mystery, if not the necessity of it as a means of satisfying human longings, and thereby attaining power, has always been tolerant of mystics, when they could be made obedient to its behests, and has sometimes canonized them. And so we hear of Bernard of Clairvaux, and Thomas à Kempis, and Tauler, and Catherine of Sienna, and Madame Guyon, and Jansen, whose followers, after his death, made so much trouble for Louis XIV and XV in France, which Swedenborg speaks of in connection with a certain experience of his own, in the "Continuation of the Last Judgment," n. 60. And there were many others, some of whom laid the chief stress upon their personal experience, while others sought to reveal the mysteries of the unseen in the terms of philosophy. But in Protestant lands, with their greater freedom, there have grown up whole sects whose existence was a protest against dead formalism, and an emphasis of the experiential and personal side of religion. Thus arose the Anabaptists and Moravians in Germany, the Jansenists in Holland and France, and the Quakers, Shakers and Methodists in England.

If we interpret the meaning of the "mystic" in this, the broadest sense, or as one who, discontented with the formalism and dogmatism of an established church, seeks a deeper

and more spiritual basis for his faith, and greater freedom of thought and purity of life than the standards of the church afford, we may acknowledge that Swedenborg might be called a mystic. But in the usual sense of the word, and in the sense in which it was certainly used by Emerson, we are compelled to deny its propriety.

We have reached then a negative conclusion. Swedenborg was not even A mystic in the strict sense, much less "THE Mystic," or the arch-representative of mysticism, as Emerson represents him.

The philosopher of Concord finds no language too strong in describing Swedenborg's ability, scholarship, industry, and practical attainments during the period of his life which terminated when he was about 56 years of age. But he looks askance at the last 28 years. If he does not adopt the judgment of Paul by Festus—"thou art beside thyself; much learning hath made thee mad"—he reads in the change of Swedenborg's style its loss of beauty, its lack of imagination, and in his claim of being a Revelator, as well as in his pessimism in portraying the hopeless condition of the hells, evidence of at least decay. And yet he joyfully commends one feature of these later writings, which is persistent to the end, namely, Swedenborg's recognition of love as the Divine soul, and righteousness of life as the true end of man. But he strangely condemns Swedenborg's constant refrain—"shun evils *as sins*"—asking whether it be not all-sufficient to shun evil as evil. The answer to this question depends upon what shunning evil as evil means. It can easily be interpreted to mean shunning it as hurtful to one's reputation or success, that is, shunning it from a principle of self-love. Anybody, says Swedenborg, can do that, but only a Christian, or at least a believer in God as the Revealer of true laws of life, can shun evils as being sinful. Does Emerson's ignoring of sin or sinfulness betray an intellectual questioning of God as a Revealer of laws of right and wrong, or perhaps of the existence of Deity outside of man? If so, is he not inclined to mysticism himself in one of its chief expressions, namely, its pantheism, or the mingling of the Creator

and the creature? Even Matthew Arnold confesses the need of a "power not ourselves, to make for righteousness."

There is a possible use of the word "mystic" which will apply to Swedenborg in common with the most effective religious writers, although wholly apart from Emerson's idea. We may think of mysticism as identical with spiritual intuition, or the perception of realities outside the bounds of the senses and of natural reason. Bergson gives to intuition the loftiest place among human faculties, declaring that "it is to the very inwardness of life that intuition leads us." But he goes so far as to declare that intuition is opposed to intelligence. Intelligence, he affirms, turns downward towards the earth, while intuition, which he defines as self-conscious instinct, "turns upward towards life."

These statements accord with the apostle's declaration that "spiritual things are spiritually discerned." But they tend to make mystics of all spiritually perceptive men. If true in the past, will it always be equally true, that intuition is opposed to intelligence? What means the Divine statement that there were many things which Jesus would tell His disciples, which they could not bear while He was with them, but that at last they should be shown plainly of the Father, and that the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, would guide them into all truth? What means the statement in the Bible's final book that "the mystery of God shall be finished, as He hath declared to His servants the prophets"? Swedenborg beheld in the spiritual world a temple, over whose entrance were written the words, "Now it is permitted;" and this was interpreted to him to mean that the age has come when mankind will be permitted to make use of intelligence as an exponent of the hidden mysteries of faith. This, plainly, was to be something new. In other words, the race has passed the period of spiritual childhood, with its blind obedience, when it has been too often led by blind leaders of the blind, and has become a man, capable of independent thought about spiritual things.

Emerson sees a break in Swedenborg when he leaves science and philosophy behind, and becomes a theologian.

His ears hear the sweet bells becoming jangled, out of tune. Let us then glance at the outlines of Swedenborg's career, with the question in mind, Are not the two parts of his life really one?

Behold, then, Swedenborg the man. First, the boy—the boy of such remarkable spiritual penetration that his father wonders whether angels do not speak through his mouth—whether the name Emmanuel (God with us) which he has given him, be not prophetic. Hear the boy questioning his tutors as to whether faith or religion be not a matter of life. See him at the University taking a high rank as a student, and afterwards, while engaged in travel, intently observing all phases of human life, always and everywhere seeking for truth, and with equal diligence, endeavoring to make a practical use of everything. See him called to a high position of usefulness to his country in the development of the mines of Sweden, and fulfilling his duties to the utmost of his powers. Hear him resolving that he will search all planes of nature, from the mineral upwards, even to the human body, nature's highest form, the kingdom of the soul, in the hope and faith and prayer that through this means the soul itself, for which he has been unconsciously or consciously seeking all through his life, may be revealed to him.

Assuming that we are familiar with the further outlines of this wonderful life, which we have no time now even to indicate (all the more wonderful if history shall finally show that he was not the native giant whom Emerson describes), behold in that childhood the seed, in that youth the blade, in that manhood the ear, which at last, by Divine direction, became the full corn in the ear.

Behold its unity of spirit and purpose! As the English poet would tell it, see him "following the gleam" of his childhood, never forgetting his early piety, adopting as rules of life, "to read often and meditate well on the Word of the Lord," and "to be content under the dispensations of Providence." Witness his constant effort to broaden his field of knowledge, yet ever led by the one original yearning to discover the highest truth, even the soul. As the truths of

science after science are opened before him, all of them enriched by his wonderful penetration, he is never forgetful of that end with which he began. Never, as is the case with most explorers in the realm of nature, does he become sceptical of the higher realities. We find no evidence that he ever needed to offer up the prayer, "help thou mine unbelief." Moreover, he is never led astray from the search after God's truth by the temptations which lead so many investigators to immortalize themselves through their discoveries. While now recognized among astronomers as the first to suggest the nebular theory, and among physiologists as the discoverer of the gray matter of the brain as the seat of intelligence, he never paused to claim for himself the fruits of his discoveries. On the contrary, (and here is one of the strongest external evidences of his mission) he left the dissecting room, where he found himself making these original discoveries, acknowledged and described now by Dr. Ramstrom of Upsala, and others, and took up the study of physiology through the works of the most eminent, so that he might not be tempted, for doubtless he became conscious of promptings, to turn aside from the quest of the soul in the natural, selfish desire for fame or honor.

But not only unity of spirit and of purpose, but unity of method, characterized both parts of his life. That method may be summed up in his rule of life, to be as universally useful as possible. If he explored the mysteries of the skies, he sought to utilize them here on earth. Hence the new method of finding the latitude and longitude by lunar observation. If he studied physics, he sought to apply the results. Hence the airship, the submarine boat, the air-tight stove which he invented. His study of the mineral kingdom was supplemented by his great work upon mining, which long continued to be the great authority throughout Europe. His eulogist in the House of Nobles declared that it could never be told how much Swedenborg had enriched his country through his thorough investigations and discoveries in connection with his office as Assessor of Mines. But as the most prominent feature of his character was the almost per-

fect equilibrium between those outer and inner powers, which with most highly endowed or active minds commonly tend to one-sidedness and even insanity, so all his activities were held in the same balanced relation. The mere scientist, like Darwin, dwells on sensuous facts until his higher faculties become atrophied by disuse. The religious mystic leaves earth behind and seeks communion with the unseen and invisible. But with Swedenborg, from the beginning, the scientific, philosophical and religious elements were always present and combined on the practical plane of use, not only in the former, but in the latter period of his life, in which, as the servant of the Lord, he treated of the wisdom of the angels, and as the statesman, and a member of the upper house of the Swedish Parliament until his death, he took an active part in such questions as the currency, the balance of trade, and the remedy for intemperance. What wonder that his eulogist, after his death, should describe him as a "sincere lover of mankind"! What wonder that all the suspicions respecting his sanity of which we have heard, originated long after his death, while those who knew him in life, as Professor Parsons has shown, never once suspected or suggested it!

But was there then no dividing line between the latter and the former periods of his life? Was there no break?

In one sense only. There was a period of silence before men, which proved to be also the result of a season of silence before the Lord, when all that was of the earth "kept silence before Him." It was a season of deep heart searching, during which not only was the spiritual world gradually and at first obscurely opened to him through the medium of what he records as "Dreams," but through these deep heart searchings and humiliations the last lingering selfish ambitions were purged away, and he was fitted to be the Lord's servant, and no longer his own. "I would be thine, not mine," he wrote; and yet asked forgiveness for claiming such humility. His development has reached the high water mark of the gospel standard. He has become a little child.

From that time not only the substance of his writing is changed, but its style also. Emerson complains of this. He has lost his beauty. He has lost his poetry. Emerson seems to worship beauty. He belongs in Greece. He sees nothing above man. He seems to rebuke those who bring the little children to the Master.

But have not some of us, with Emerson, wished that Swedenborg might have retained in his latter works, something of his former Greek tendencies, and set forth these new and stupendous things with eloquence and grace and power, appealing to the affections? If, instead of the calm, emotionless, cold, Roman, legal declarations and definitions, and rugged, logical statements, he could have spoken with Chrysostom's silver tongue, or with Charles Wesley's poetic fervor, or Robertson's persuasive logic, might he not have carried a great multitude with him? Is there not some indirect connection, between this absence of external attractiveness and the words of the prophet: "when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him—he is despised and rejected of men?" As the Master's servant, does he not partake of the Master's spirit?

Or might he not have drawn another and different multitude had he appealed to the natural curiosity respecting the hereafter, or employed the method of the spiritist or the occultist? Doubtless the whole borderland between the two worlds (which is the realm of the occultist) was familiar to him, as evidenced by the story of the Stockholm fire, which he witnessed hundreds of miles away. But he is strangely silent on this subject. And as for the methods of spiritism, we are all familiar with his stern condemnation of them, while his history proves his knowledge of them. How gently yet firmly he refused to answer personal inquiries about the other world prompted by a selfish curiosity! How often we hear him say, "I could have said more, but it is not permitted"! Not permitted, because it would have appealed not to the spiritual, but to the earthly nature. Even his pictures of the future life are unattractive oftentimes, even to avowed believers, because they present the spiritual

or inner meaning of that life rather than its outward phenomena. Many are therefore repelled by the "Memorable Relations" of conversations or happenings in that world. And so these pictures, instead of leading us to dwell on the future life at the expense of this, bid us back to this life, to work out our own salvation; and so that (to continue our original thought) there may be no mere mysticism or lack of spiritual intelligence in our faith in the great future. And so the winged cherubim stand at Eden's gate, with a sword which turns every way, to guard the way of the tree of life!

Here, then, is the secret of Swedenborg's long and wonderful preparation in all the knowledge of this world before he became aware of his mission. It was that a true philosophy of the connection or correspondence between the two worlds might be revealed to him in rational forms, and so that the two worlds might be united. This was the reason why, when the veil which separated the two worlds was removed from his eyes, instead of living henceforth a life of mysticism, separate from the world, he pursued his study of truth in that world by the same method and with the same zeal and industry which had distinguished him in the study of this world. His former study made it possible to explain the connection of the two worlds by the universal law of correspondence. His revelation of the connection of the two worlds is the antithesis of the method of the mystic, which separated the inner from the outer, making it indeed a mysterious realm.

Again: Swedenborg's revelations of the inner world, both subjective and objective, furnish the spiritual intuitions of men with an earthly and rational basis, removing superstition, banishing mystery, and investing this world and its experiences with a meaning, an importance and a sacredness which they never had before.

But there are two sides to this earthly basis of intuition. "Spiritual things," says Paul, "are spiritually discerned," only now the spiritual discernment of former days is supplemented by an answering earthly basis. But a truly spiritual discernment implies a regenerate state of the heart, apart

from mere intellect or genius. This is presumably the reason why much that Swedenborg speaks of as rationally demonstrated remains obscure even to students. The rationality to which he appeals especially in his Scripture interpretations, is largely a spiritual or regenerate rationality.

A genuine spiritual affection contains the potency of an answering reason on its own plane, for there is no love without truth. Hence it is that so often Swedenborg's readers recognize in his writings what was before an unconscious belief, which the outward revelation completes and establishes.

And hence Swedenborg's unfoldings may be of direct or indirect service to the people of all churches, as fast and as far as they are inwardly prepared to recognize their truth through their connection with the new heavens. Already the New-Church teachings respecting the spiritual body and the spiritual world are recognized as a contribution which the New Church has made to theology, and other doctrines are beginning to be recognized as being from the same source. Does not the fact of his being able to publish his teachings through the press, which he speaks of in connection with the declaration of his mission in "True Christian Religion," n. 779, indicate the universality of his work?

While Swedenborg often implies that an opened or regenerate spiritual mind is necessary to an understanding of his writings, he appears to teach (*e.g.* Doctrine of the Sacred Scripture, n. 4) that the outlines of his teachings on this subject are an appeal to the "natural man" who has the disposition to be convinced. Perhaps largely for this reason he makes so much use of the literal sense of the Word to confirm the spiritual doctrines, and he sometimes even tells us that he writes for unwilling believers, or for those who otherwise would not believe at all (Arcana Coelestia, n. 2094). But this is only another way of saying that he has not left the world behind, that he is not leading men into mysticism, but is striving to make religion a matter of life for all sorts and conditions of men.

And so it is, as he assures us at the very close of his so

mistakenly called "mystical writings" (True Christian Religion, n. 779), that he comes, not merely as an individual relating his personal experiences of things unseen, but as a Revelator, the "servant of the Lord Jesus Christ," completing His promise to come again in the clouds of heaven, that is, to dispel mysteries, and fulfill the Divine promise to shew us "plainly of the Father," to "speak no more in proverbs," and, led by the Spirit of Truth, to "guide into all truth," and shew us "things to come." (John xiv-xvi.)

If we ask, then, why Swedenborg, although appealing to the reason, is not more widely accepted, while the comparatively illiterate Jacob Behmen, who has been called an embryonic Swedenborg, is recognized as a philosopher, we find, first, a partial answer in the statement that Swedenborg appeals so often to a regenerated rationality. But beyond this, we find a reason in the immensity of his system, and in the universality of his appeal to the intellect, but especially to the life. Who among us will claim to comprehend it all, or to realize the unity of it all? Like the Holy City, it is equal in length, breadth and height. It reaches back beyond history's beginnings, it reaches forward to the limitless future. Resting on the lowest granite foundations of the earth, it stretches upwards to the very throne of God. He speaks of things transcending human ken when he tells of the "heaven of human internals," and he descends to things most earthly. He speaks to saints and he speaks to sinners. The true mystic declares that "a virtue that aims at reward is no virtue," yet Swedenborg, while holding out the same high motive to all who are able to receive it, yet appeals to those on a low plane by the hope of heaven, or even the fear of hell. The apparent lack of unity is explained by the universality of his appeal. If he had stopped at the "Divine Love and Wisdom" or the "Divine Providence," he might be today classed with philosophers.

Another reason why his writings do not appeal to the ordinary thinker is because of their very general character. Even the "science of correspondences," vital as it is to the system, is presented in the main in universal instead of

definite forms. Emerson complains of this. All his symbols, he declares, mean the same few things. But why? So that we may do our own thinking, our own reasoning; so that we may work these things out for ourselves, and thus make them our own, wholly apart from the pressure of external authority, or from the spirit of unwholesome persuasion.

And yet, while not openly acknowledged as a Revelator, Swedenborg's influence is silently extending. The influx from the new heavens finds its completion or fulfillment in his writings, not so much in their appeal to feeling as in their appeal to truth. For it has been said that the Latin is a legal not a religious language. Freedom and rationality are the watchwords of the new age.

In the reaction from the destructive higher criticism, we are witnessing in the Protestant bodies today the disposition to return to Jesus Christ as the practical Exemplifier of a spiritual life and thus of true religion. And this notwithstanding the questioning of the Virgin Birth. While not as yet accepted as the One God, He is coming to be regarded as picturing to the world the character of the One God. May this not be a fulfillment of the admonition of the Saviour to the Jews and to His own apostles, "Though ye believe not me, believe the works that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in Him;" "believe me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me, or else believe me for the very works' sake"? He is speaking to the heart today as the One God, but to the understanding He remains a mystery. It cannot always be thus. If the hearts of men are crying out with the eleven apostles on that last fateful night, "Shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us," that cry must be answered, and in the words of the Saviour Himself: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." While the later interpretations of the Father and the Son were not held in the apostles' time, yet the relation between them was not understood. Even Paul, to whom Jesus had spoken from heaven, and who was converted to Christianity by His power of love, which he afterwards declared to be the greatest thing in the world,

yet confessed he counted not himself to have apprehended; he saw as in a copper mirror, indistinctly, but this did not prevent him from leaving old things behind, and stretching forward to the things that were before, in the race for the prize, namely, "the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." Sometime he would understand, sometime see face to face. One thing he knew—the prize of life was to be found in the fact that in some mysterious but unmistakable way, God was calling men through the voice and life of Jesus.

Swedenborg is answering with the calm voice of the philosopher the human cry for a reconciliation of Jesus and God the Father. He tells of the assumption of the Divine Humanity as the finishing of the Divine advent of the ages. The revelation of today supplements the yearning and belief of the heart with an answering intellectual response and confirmation, and brings it from the realm of mystery down to earth. To some at least, in these latter days, the merest glimpse of this truth of Jesus as the one God has been attended by a deep and wondrous joy—a joy too deep for words, if not too deep for tears. It banishes all the dark fears bound up with the belief in Jesus as the victim of His Father's wrath by the rational assurance that whoever sees Him sees the Father. Jesus the Glorified is our Father, our Saviour, our Lover, our Friend, our ever-present Help. In Him the great mystery of God, and with this the great mystery of life, is finished. We have our work to do before we can realize this in our lives; as He overcame the powers of darkness, so must we overcome, shunning all that He tells us is evil, and shunning it, not merely as hurtful to ourselves, but as sin against His truth, or, better still, against His spirit of perfect love. While there is no end of minor mysteries remaining, the great, deep mystery of God is finished, as He hath declared to His servants the prophets (Revelation x, 7).

Returning finally to our first thought—the new unfolding of the Divine Word, which was Swedenborg's greatest work, is the coming of the Lord in the clouds with glorious light—the clouds of the Bible, which, without that light, diminish

and refract the light of heaven, coming, too, in the clouds or mysteries in human life, bringing freedom, reason, joy and peace to the heart prepared to accept that truth of truths: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

I will close with an extract from the work of Houston Stewart Chamberlain, entitled "The Foundation of the Nineteenth Century." He is a profound student of Christian as well as more ancient history, recognizing and defining the corruption of the church, tracing its downward movement, and, as a higher critic of extreme type, believing that much has been incorporated in the Gospels to further the purposes of a designing priesthood, including the Virgin Birth, and of course a confirmed enemy of the Romish Church, which he characterizes as severely as Swedenborg himself, never revealing his own personal theology on the ground of its sacredness to himself, he stands as a type of the New Protestantism, which has been alluded to. After finishing his condemnation of Romanism, he says:

In my account, as I promised, the center of all Christianity—the Figure on the Cross—has remained untouched. And it is this Figure which binds us all together, no matter how we may be separated by mode of thought and tendency of race. It is my good fortune to possess several good and true friends among the Catholic clergy, and to the present day I have not lost one. I remember moreover a very highly gifted Dominican, who liked to argue with me and to whom I am indebted for much information on theological matters, exclaiming in despair, "You are a terrible man! Not even St. Thomas Aquinas could be a match for you!" And yet the reverend gentleman did not withdraw from me his good graces, nor I from him my admiration. What united us was greater and mightier than all that separated us; it was the figure of Jesus Christ. Though each may have believed the other to be so fettered to false error, that, transferred to the arena of the world, he would not have hesitated for a moment to attack him, yet, in the stillness of the cloister, where I was wont to visit the father, we always found ourselves drawn into that condition so beautifully described by Augustine, in which everything—even the voice of the angels—is silent, and only One speaks; then we knew that we were united, and with equal conviction we both confessed, "Heaven and Earth shall pass away, but His words shall not pass away."

JOHN GODDARD.

EMERSON THE CRITIC.

CRITICISM is often like a two-edged sword: while it penetrates the adversary it may cut deeply into the one who wields it. Thus Emerson in his attempt to appreciate "representative men" at their true worth is unwittingly revealing his own limitations. Plato, he assures us, "had no system," hence the failure at many points of one of the greatest philosophers. But the difficulty is that Emerson himself failed to develop a system, although he cherished the conviction that in the end all his insights would prove to be compatible. Plato's famous Dialogues contain a system which Emerson failed to grasp, chiefly because the latter was a poet-seer rather than a philosopher in the strict sense of the word. So, too, in his adverse criticism of Swedenborg Emerson is judging himself. Having concluded that he was wrong in calling the Swedish seer a "mystic," it is interesting to consider why the Concord seer failed.

One reason has already been given by implication. Swedenborg was systematic to a remarkable degree, and Emerson did not care to plod through so voluminous a writer in quest of the central principles. Had he grasped these he could never have classified Swedenborg among those who primarily depend on mystic insights and experiences. Emerson habitually read those parts of a book that interested him, gleaning ideas here and there from the great literatures of the world. In a vaguely universal sense, it is remarkable how many people of differing points of view can claim Emerson. In one side he is so near the spiritual pantheism of the Orient that the Hindoos see in some of his poems and essays their own profoundest thoughts given back to them. On another side, no writer is more individualistic than he. One looks in vain for a single coherent principle bringing these conflicting ideas into intelligible order.

Another reason is psychological. Although Emerson endeavors to be true to all sides of man's nature, he has no clear-cut conception of the human mind in terms of the will and the understanding. His term "soul" wavers between the finite mind at its best and the "universal mind" to which every man is an "inlet." He finds "no bar or wall in the soul where man, the effect, ceases, and God, the cause, begins." It seems to him that a poetic expression implying the blending of our powers, and the ineffable intimacy of God and man, is nearer than any definition, however comprehensive. Consequently, he employs his psychological terms interchangeably, and passes almost imperceptibly from the natural to the spiritual. It seems to him far more important to be true to inner experience as it passes, as actually perceived, than to indulge in precise analysis, or attempt to interpret the inner life from a single point of view. This may be all right for the poet or mystic. Some would prefer Emerson's half-poetic, half-philosophical interpretations of the human self and its experiences to all the psychological treatises in the world. But to estimate the mystics one must possess a method of precise psychological analysis. Rightly to interpret Swedenborg one must be still more thoroughly equipped, inasmuch as his works are at once psychological and theological.

Again, Emerson refers to truth in fluid terms, and makes no distinction between Divine and human truth. However final a system of knowledge may be, so he is persuaded, some one may at any time appear with a larger insight, surpassing the boasted system as a larger circle encompasses a smaller. Hence he holds that the one in whom love of truth predominates will "keep aloof from all moorings and afloat." Truth for him is "a flying perfect" ever eluding us because greater than any of our classifications. The best that one can do is to collect and narrate "anecdotes of the intellect," revering the perfect whole which is forever marred by our attempts to grasp it. Hence his thought is very far from doctrinal systems of all types, and he was suspicious of Swedenborg's supposedly exhaustive theology.

It is natural, then, that Emerson should lament the fact that Swedenborg was turned aside by a "theologic bias." Here we meet a cardinal difference between the two writers. It was the doctrine of the Lord which gave to Swedenborg's system the centrality which Emerson disliked. This idea runs through Swedenborg's chief works, and more than any other distinguishes his writings from those of all the mystics. For the system is thereby made to turn about a conception of the Divine-Human personality. The Concord seer, on the other hand, saw in Jesus essentially a man, one who "was true to what is in you and me." Accordingly, he dwelt on the universal principle in a rather general or impersonal way. Without his "bias," Swedenborg might have propounded a strictly neutral system of correspondences, so thought Emerson. That which Emerson admired most Swedenborg cared nothing for. Where Swedenborg was rationalistic, Emerson was mystical, sliding over those distinctions which for Swedenborg were decisively marked in terms of discrete degrees.

Although Emerson shows a measure of insight into the principle of correspondences as a universal clue, he does not develop this principle concretely. In his essay entitled "Compensation" he also shows appreciation of another great principle, the duality of all things as a clue to nature and human life. He is on the point of grasping a great secret, and through this priceless possession attaining the needed union between the dual phases of his own nature. But stopping just short of the illuminating principle, his thought does not grow. Despite his inspiring ideal of truth as "a flying perfect," he is unable to realize his hope that his several insights belong together. In some of his later essays he is indeed more systematic, but no more profound; and the ideas advanced are essentially the same. He does not bring his varying statements together so as to discover their own deeper implications. Hence his work remains that of the seer, in contrast with a philosopher like Hegel who had a central insight and then devoted his life to its orderly development.

To say this, is not to depreciate Emerson, but to see that criticism is not his province. He is more truly a mystic than Swedenborg. Yet one is warned by his suggestive statement that "each new mind is a new classification" not to attach any one term to his name. His genius must be appreciated with reference to his own type, his age, his influence. He is one of the greatest essayists of all time, and to the end of time some readers will prefer an essayist to a theologian or man of science. But Swedenborg is even more distinctively Swedenborg. One cannot estimate him by any canon formulated by Emerson. His rationalism must be tested by reference to the Scriptures to which it is said to be the clue, not by reference to the mystics. His experiences were to Emerson signs of the abnormal, and yet Emerson did not propose any standard by which one might detect the abnormal in contrast with the normal. Experience for Emerson was sacred, too, but in a wholly different sense. One must be prepared, then, to study each of these writers by himself, remembering Emerson's warning that "Nature never rhymes her children."

HORATIO W. DRESSER.

DOCTRINE AND EXPERIENCE.

IN his essay on Swedenborg, Emerson doubtless seems to most of us not to hold consistently to his statement that Swedenborg "led the most real life of any man then in the world." Yet there was no reason for him to depart from it. For, delighted as Swedenborg was to project theory into the unknown, he always held one hand back on the actual. His mind demanded touch with present experience. If he purposed to fling out an hypothesis concerning the soul, it had to start in anatomical fact. He would have no theory that did not answer to fact, nor any doctrine that did not agree with experience. Exhaustive observation preceded theory. "The Economy of the Animal Kingdom" he considered first "anatomically and physically," then "philosophically." Rather than backward, he threw a hand forward to keep touch on the actual as he thought his subject out. In the "Last Judgment" (posthumous) he remarks,

All theoretical matters are to be drawn and concluded from experiences, and are also to be confirmed by them. Unless experimental things, as it were, lead man's hand, he may be deluded in theoretical matters.

Of course he hugged the shore of the actual in this way notoriously in his so-called scientific period. Evincing lively delight and great ambitiousness in framing hypotheses in a number of sciences, from the first he insisted on the rigorous reference of every theory to fact. He feels encouraged only as fact conspires with theory. In a letter to his brother-in-law, he writes,

I take the chemical experiments of Boyle, Reucher, Hjarne, Simons and others, and trace out nature in its least things. . . . I am also encouraged every day by new discoveries as to the nature

of these subtle substances; and as I am beginning to see that experience in uninterrupted series seems to be inclined to agree therewith, I am becoming more and more confirmed in my ideas.

This letter precedes the extract from the posthumous "Last Judgment," quoted above, by just forty years. He goes on:

It seems to me that the immense number of experiments that have been made affords a good ground for building upon; and that the toil and expenses incurred by others may be turned to use by working up with the head what they have collected with their hands.

So throughout his scientific period. He collects the experiments of others, "explores," as he puts it, "by means of experience and phenomena," and then from the floor of fact thus laid rises the more securely to the theoretical view of his subject. He makes experiments himself for a time; even when he comes to the study of anatomy he uses the dissecting room himself on occasion; but here he begins to garner his facts chiefly from plates and books. It is at this point that he purposely gives up experiments of his own. Because of his desire for the securest possible hold on the experimental, and lest his forecasted theory affect his experiments, he resolves to use only the data of other workers. This same tendency and habit of mind, as well, surely, as his eminent desire to put his ideas to use, has led him to lodge in turn where he could learn a new trade, by which, as he says, he has stolen the trade of the bookbinder, the watchmaker, the cabinet maker, the mathematical instrument maker, the engraver on copper and the grinder of lenses. Mention of the mathematical instrument maker recalls another remark of Swedenborg's, indicative in part, too, of his zealous reference of theory to experiment and so to usefulness. As a young man he writes his brother-in-law that

It is a fatality with mathematicians that they remain mostly in theory. I have thought that it would be a profitable thing if to ten mathematicians there was added one thoroughly practical man, by whom the others could be led to market.

But the same habit of referring the theoretical to the experimental, we are not so well aware, went with Swedenborg into his theological period. His very childhood suggested that it would do so. Before he entered his 'teens he was sure that charity, not faith, was the greatest in the world of the spirit; and at times his remarks were so unusual that his parents would exclaim that angels spoke through his mouth. The primacy of charity, as a doctrine, was already linked in his childhood with an experience of that world where the spiritual life was to lie open to the view of his trained observation, and where he could fit doctrine to experience. In this respect as well as many others, therefore, his life, long and varied as it was, appears again the unity which under Providence it was.

As a theologian he was not to frame doctrine at a distance from the facts of the world which in thought he was now entering. He should enter it in actual experience, too. The reality that pervades his treatises on the other world, the increasingly matter-of-fact style now, and the tranquil progress of his thought generally, testify that he is as ever in touch with the actual. Doctrine is answering still to the experimentally ascertainable. In the "Arcana" we find three lines of work going forward in a profoundly inter-related way. There is the spiritual interpretation of Scripture, itself impossible without experience of the other world; there is the interjected doctrinal material, and the interjected description of the life to come. The last line of work contains the basis on which he is building in the other two lines. He refers the theological doctrine for confirmation to experience of the other world, with such observations, for instance, as this (*Arcana Coelestia*, 6058): "But these subjects ought to be illustrated by experiences, else things so unknown and rendered so obscure by hypotheses cannot be brought forth into the light." In other words, the spiritual world now lay to Swedenborg's hand like a vast laboratory, where he could ground the doctrine of spiritual life in experience; and in the overt experience not of a few, but of all from all ages and earths. It is such revelation

that Swedenborg calls "immediate revelation," "granted at this day" and "meant by the Coming of the Lord" (Heaven and Hell, 1).

Despite his religious bringing up and disposition, Swedenborg had failed to become acquainted with the details of the traditional theology. He felt its foreignness to spiritual experience. And at the commencement of his theological period, his habit of keeping theory in touch with fact enables him to see how far indeed the traditional theology has departed from being a description of actual spiritual life. Christian doctrine had sprung out of Christian experience at first. The Apostles formed their ideas of God from their acquaintance with the Lord. Their teaching took form in what they heard, saw and felt. "That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, . . . and our hands have handled . . . declare we unto you" (1 John 1:1, 3). But before many generations passed, theology turned speculative. It departed from the Christian life experience. On the basis of philosophical conceptions, and through an interpretation of Scripture that was wholly fragmentary, it grew into the traditional system. It forsook the facts of experience, and came to be at odds with religion. There, divorced from spiritual experience, Swedenborg found it. In "A Death in the Desert," Browning makes the dying Apostle John feel this ultimate departure of teaching from experience:

"If I live yet, it is for good, more love,
Through me to men: be naught but ashes here
That keep awhile my semblance, who was John,—
Still, when they scatter, there is left on earth
No one alive who knew (consider this!)
—Saw with his eyes and handled with his hands
That which was from the first, the Word of Life.
How will it be when one more saith, 'I saw'?"

The theology of Swedenborg's mission, accordingly, could not be a development from the old. The latter was misexpression of spiritual life. Swedenborg's denunciation of it went far more on the ground that it was become

destructive of religion than that it was illogical; logical enough it often was, its premises once granted. It disorganized men's spiritual life. On referring it to the facts of spiritual life, as these were disclosed to him with the other world, this became absolutely plain to him. If therefore he was to connect the new teaching with the old, it must be far back in the latter's history, in a creed not yet moved off the base of experience, or with such doctrine as the instruction read to prospective communicants in his time, instruction that was true to the facts of spiritual growth. Else he built anew. The new theology had to be an isolated system of doctrine. We read in the *Diary*:

It was represented to me in a certain manner that I was not to contaminate myself by reading other books treating on theology and similar subjects; because all this I have from the Word of God and the Holy Spirit.

Much later Swedenborg refers to the same prohibition in a letter to Dr. Beyer, saying,

I was forbidden to read writers and dogmatic and systematic theology . . . , because unfounded opinions and inventions might have easily insinuated themselves thereby, which afterwards could only have been removed with difficulty.

Swedenborg's theological period naturally starts then in a new experience of spiritual life. This included a private experience of the Lord and of regeneration at His hands, which he recorded, contemporaneously with the event, in the *Diary* and particularly in the *Dream Book*, extraordinary documents of religious experience. The Lord, mediately of course, yet manifested Himself to him in Person. Profound spiritual changes preceded and followed this. These he quite evidently described as early as the writing of "The Animal Kingdom." His whole experience recalls John and his "That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, . . . and our hands have handled, . . . declare we unto you." The new doctrine should not start from a mere conception of God, but from acquaintance with the Lord, as with John. The link between the old and the

new is with the apostolic days. How plain this is from the fact that when it came time to herald the new life of the Second Coming the original apostles cried it to the whole spiritual world!

Yet it is not Swedenborg's own religious development in the transitional years and afterwards which is the experimental base of the new doctrine. Not by any means. That base is infinitely broader. Never was there a more fertile opportunity for a theologian to frame teaching upon his own spiritual experience. This he perfectly avoids, which would have been mysticism. From his own experience he could have supplied experimental basis for more than one teaching. For example, he has much to reveal of the secrecy with which the Divine Providence operates, and of how its operation is seen only in past event. Is that law of Providence better illustrated anywhere than in his own surprise that he is led to a theological career, and in his perception later how carefully prepared he has been from the first for just that career? The doctrine had to him convincing basis in his own experience; but not on that single experience, nor on the experience of a number of men, but only on the impartial experience and data of spiritual life as a whole, as it lay open to his observation in the other world, would he, could he rest the new teaching. The impersonalism of the theological works is sign how completely his merely private experience is hidden behind the public experience that went with his mission. The former was incidentally necessary, as personal preparation, to the performance of his mission; but upon the latter, as a broad, comprehensive base, his statement of the doctrines of the spiritual life had to rest. He has had in his own private experience evidence enough that the Lord is God, but that is not the experience which he adduces in confirmation of his chief doctrine. Rather he cites the experience of all heaven, as in the "Arcana," 14, where he says of the Lord, "He is acknowledged and adored as Lord throughout the whole heaven." Neither did he ever publish the records of his own more private experience. And disclaiming the authorship of the

doctrines resting upon the public experience of the other world, he asks, "what man can draw such things from himself?" He is the witness to infinitely more than his own experience. He enjoys an elevation of his understanding over and beyond his own spiritual growth, enabling him to range the whole world of religious experience. Do we wonder when he says this surpasses all miracles?

To this width of experience he keeps referring to each doctrine for verisimilitude. In the greatest possible laboratory of the spiritual life, the other world, his extraordinary faculty of observation keeps touch with the reality which he is studying. By the Divine mercy the spiritual world is opened to him not simply that *it* may be disclosed to men. To know spiritual life, whose doctrines he is to publish, he had best observe it in its own world, in its own revealing surroundings. We may well be amazed at the scope of the teaching which he grounds in this experience of the other world. The whole doctrine of correspondences gets erected, of course, on his simultaneous observation of both worlds. That man is the end of the universe is a teaching that rests upon his acquaintance with men and women from other earths. His disclosures about the pre-historic, ancient churches involve intercourse with men and women of the first spiritual civilizations. The Word's communication with heaven, the nature of the love of ruling over others (Divine Providence, 315), the state of angels who spoke the Word of the Lord (Arcana Cœlestia, 1925), that men of every religion are saved (Arcana Cœlestia, 2284(4)), that those who die children enter heaven so and grow up there (Arcana Cœlestia, 2290), that there is a love truly conjugal, that memory is indestructible (2475), these, and particular teachings uncountable, proceed upon some experience of the truth of them. What we are told of the nature of death is a most striking instance of how thoroughly all the teaching is fixed in experience. Swedenborg did not simply observe the death and resuscitation of others. He himself underwent the process as nearly as could be without actually dying and passing out of this world. The two works on

the Apocalypse afford another remarkable illustration of the dependence of the new doctrine on experience of the spiritual world. "The Apocalypse Explained," never finished nor actually published by Swedenborg, was written before the Last Judgment was fully accomplished; then, abandoned, was followed by a treatise whose teaching was all the clearer because the subjects with which it dealt, had been made perfectly clear in the events of the last general judgment. The condemnation at that judgment, too, of various teachings of the old theology, as misleading, and as positively destructive to spiritual life, also formed for him now the full experiential basis for his break with the current doctrines.

What could indicate more forcefully than this constant rigorous reference of doctrine to experience, that theology is but the study of spiritual life which is the reality? That the Heavenly Doctrines have been shaped to give men re-entrance upon spiritual life? That they are means in our hands for coming into the experience of spiritual life? True to the reality, they are to give religion and all its spiritual forces scope again in human life. They are not a new religion, but a new understanding of religion. They do not create a new life, but, noting its rise in the new heavens, only herald it, give men to understand it, and enable them to grow in it, as it enters this world in human hearts and minds. With the help of these doctrines we are to recognize spiritual life, its beginnings in us and in the world, its manner of growth, above all its Lord and source, and come into fuller and fuller experience of it. The steady conforming of the doctrines, in the formulation of them, to the full experience of spiritual life in the other world, indicates how we shall hold them, not as an end in themselves, but the means only of entrance on spiritual life. They do not create, but serve to foster and herald in the world and in the individual, the indwelling life of the new heavens.

The object of my essay is to detail this attitude to the doctrines. even to giving examples of how it expresses, or might express itself, and to say a few things that I hope will quicken us in this attitude—or even set us in it for the first

time, for I do not see that it is the attitude generally occupied.

We are accustomed to saying that we put life before doctrine. We are all well aware that doctrine is useless unless conformed to in life. But that very way of speaking betrays the primacy of doctrine in our thought; it is that to which life is conformed. By life, then, too, we mean more especially conduct, not so much inner experience, though the doctrines mean by it both and the latter primarily. "If ye know these things happy are ye if ye do them," is a blessing upon practising what we know; but it does not sum up our whole spiritual aspiration for us, or should not. Some such saying as the Lord's to Nathanael might do so: "Ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." My point is not that we do not apply the doctrines to life, not at all; but that by them we want first to seize on a new and different inner life. More than conforming thought, feeling and action to doctrine, we should, using the doctrine to come into touch with them, aspire after experience of the great inner realities of the spiritual life, as for instance those held up to our ardent sight in the Blessings.

Because I have in mind such inner life as the Blessings describe, I feel I am not falling into mysticism. I mean a personal spiritual experience possible to men generally, and not only to certain types and temperaments. On this the doctrines are intent; of this they are statements. Religious experience commonly begins in a sense of something wrong, discordant, evil in our lives; the doctrines of hereditary and acquired evil, of conscience, of self-examination and of confession have to do with this initial experience. There are kinds of experience like this, surely not at all advanced, which should just as surely not be foreign to us. A first and easy experience is that of the disappearance from us of the very inclinations to an evil or sin when we have persisted in shunning, with appeal to the Lord, every form of the evil in thought, feeling and act. This is simple experience of the Saviour's power. It surely belongs to no spe-

cial type of religious experience. The influx of energy, the revelation of hope, which the doctrines say come in prayer, we ought to be acquainted with. To one who uses the Word for the influences which it brings around him, there ought to be a different atmosphere clinging to a book having the spiritual sense from that of one without it. A growing, clarifying, personal relation to the Lord would be the center and sum of our inner life. There are limits, wholesome and plain, on the personal experience consciously possible to us. The greater part of regeneration is affected interiorly to our awareness of it; it notices itself to us only in strengthening spiritual purpose, in growing enlightenment. But while our conscious progress does not extend to the Lord's whole work in us, let us have some aspiration, some clearly tokened growing inner life! "My goodness extendeth not to Thee, but to the saints that are in the earth, and to the excellent, in whom is all my delight."

But to illustrate. How, for example, would regarding the doctrines not simply as rules to conform life to, but as the means of attaining to the simple realities of spiritual experience, influence our reading and study of the doctrines of the church? It would inspire more reading than is done now; it would also do away with some of the reading being done now. The acquisition of the doctrines in the abstract would be less an object with us. We should keep asking as we read, and naturally we should read much more slowly then, "What is the thing here in mind?" "What is the Divine influence, the character-growth, the possibility in me, that this passage seeks to put me in touch with?" There would be more reading, and more reading for the life's sake; there might be less knowledge that pretended to comprehensiveness and authoritativeness, but there would be more spiritual life. Have you not seen readers of these exhaustless teachings seize one teaching that met their needs and make it their own? With it they saw their way. Spectacles were what they needed. And you have seen others trying to know, first of all, as much as they could of the doctrines. They were interested in being as expert as pos-

sible in the teachings of the Church. They wanted not so much to see their own way as to see farther than others. They found a telescope on their hands, one so intricate, and of so many parts, that, occupied as they were in discovering new parts, they never assembled it, and never got a look through it, to our knowledge. For like reasons, I am sure that we do not do well to discount those among us who do not talk doctrine or who do not take interest, as we say, in doctrinal questions. Interest in doctrine for any public purpose such as discussion is surely not to be identified with a vital interest in doctrine as a way of life and spiritual growth. Those who take the latter interest in the teachings of the church, however quietly, are not the "uninstructed," nor the "external" in the church.

The attitude toward the doctrines, to which the manner of their formulation would point us, would get itself well expressed in any of our societies in a class in personal religion, where the doctrines would be studied as they run closest to elementary spiritual experience, and where the effort would be the stimulation and instruction of the religious life and thinking of the members of it. The class would consider the using of prayer, confession and the whole work of self-examination, how to meet particular temptations, and what the simpler evidences of spiritual growth may be. Questions for actual help would be asked; comments from actual help offered. In the Reading Circle the other evening, when the point was made that the Lord is present in a particular relation to each individual, a member remarked, "I grow surer of that from day to day." It was simply said, and by one who rarely speaks in the Circle, but whose life was touched at this point. A spiritual fellowship among its members is necessary to such a class, which is invaluable in itself, for the ardor and religious force it gives a society; the instruction involves the pastoral relation, and requires the pastor for teacher and leader.

But these are minor ways of giving expression to that attitude to the doctrines which holds them as the means of spiritual experience; constant, larger expression can be given

it in pulpit and pew; in the pew, because the attitude cannot be usefully taken in the pulpit unless the pew encourages it there. The attitude in question asks of the sermon that it address itself primarily to life needs; among these are intellectual needs; but needs, too, which the sermon aiming first at doctrinal instruction does not minister to. By life needs I mean such conditions as grief, blindness to evil, absence of spiritual purpose, irresponsiveness to religious influence, bondage to materialism, unreality of the spiritual life, helplessness before temptation, spiritual discouragement. A sermon is not a page out of the doctrines. *They* are a new understanding of religion. *It* should preach religion as newly understood. It would not ideally teach, for instance, the doctrine of remains. That is class work. It would ideally *use* the doctrine of remains in preaching the Word in such a way as to call out and quicken remains in the listeners. In such a sermon the doctrine is present, but actively so, and sunk in ministry to spiritual life. For worshippers to be quickened in this vital way is far more than to learn a statement of the doctrine with no experience answering to its purpose in their lives.

Still more evident expression would the use of the doctrines as the means of spiritual experience find in missionary work. Whether we deliberately formulate it so or not, the aim that actually regulates a large part of our missionary methods is the purpose simply of spreading abroad the doctrines, of winning from others conviction of the truth of them. Of course we expect practical help to go with them. We address ourselves however to intellectual needs, as though people generally were seeking a systematic theology. Naturally we meet intellectual interest. It may be a curious interest only, or it may be one of satisfaction now with logical, strong and even helpful doctrines. Aiming by our bent of mind and kind of preparation at meeting intellectual inquiry, we miss the more vital touch and service which we could effect with that larger audience that has life needs, as over against just intellectual needs. There is a direct and simple ministry to the desire for a Saviour, to the perfunc-

tory use of the Word, to the hope and doubt of the bereaved, which the subordination of doctrinal interest to religious alone will enable us to make. The religious work at the Lynn Neighborhood House is significant in this connection. There we have decided, at least for the present, not to teach doctrine simply, but to use it as needed and teach it as needed. The result is a growing interest. It is easy to find the larger life needs there, and inspiring to minister to them. I hope we shall not overlay the spiritual life of that enterprise with an accumulation of unused doctrine.

In our view of the world, as to which way it is going, forward or backward, in religious things, there the holding of the doctrines as means of spiritual experience and development finds a principal field for influence. If we are more intent on the spiritual experience that we should be able to attain to with the help of the doctrines, than on the doctrinal riches that mark us off from the world, we shall not find that we are marked off from the rest of the world. Not only because as a body we do not reduce to striking spiritual possession the doctrines on which by one mercy and another we have come, but because enlightenment and impulse from the new heavens are at work throughout the world. Do we believe in the nearness of the two worlds? In the fact of influx? In the doctrine of enlightenment in particular? In the progressive accomplishment of the Lord's Second Coming, not simply as an historical revelation, but as a nearer presence of His to men here?

After the last judgment was accomplished, there was then joy in heaven, and also light in the world of spirits, such as was not before. . . . A similar light also then arose in men in the world, giving them new enlightenment. (Continuation concerning the Last Judgment, 30.)

This is not an enlightenment that the published doctrines of the New Church alone bring; it is an enlightenment that must precede them if they are to be understood (*Arcana Cœlestia*, 4402 (3e)). It is recorded in "True Christian Religion," 797, of Melancthon, that

After the beginning of the establishment of the new heaven by the Lord, he began to think from the light from that heaven that he might possibly be in error; and in consequence, because of anxiety about his lot, he felt impressed upon him some interior ideas concerning charity. In this state he consulted the Word, and then his eyes were opened, and he saw that it was filled throughout with love to God and love to the neighbor.

Is there reason to believe that this cannot be repeated with numbers in this world today, and has not been repeated with them,—the enlightenment discarding old errors, resort to the Word for the life's sake, and consequent new apprehension of the life of charity? "Invitation to the New Church" presents this manner of advent as the interior Second Coming of the Lord, while the Heavenly Doctrine works as a more overt agency to effect it (25, Summary of the Coronis iii. e.). If therefore, instead of looking for like statements of theology to ours, we should look for broad forward tendencies like the emphatic and still growing acceptance of the Lord's spiritual leadership whatever questions remain concerning His exact relation to the Father, or like the more vital use of the Word as a book of spiritual truth however the mind is left in a quandary what to do with grave questions about that book, we should be coming at elements in the world's thought and life with which we could co-operate. We should be in touch with the anterior enlightenment (Continuation conc. the Last Judgment, 11, 12; Arcana Cœlestia, 4402 (3e)) and the nascent spiritual life abroad in this world from the other. Taking our teachings to the world then as the herald and exponent of the newly stirring life, we should be doing in our view of the world and in our co-operation with its forward tendencies, what the holding of the doctrines as the means of spiritual experience demands. "Christian Unity" is a large opportunity for this view. The spiritual life of us all is one. Those who are not advancing into the life of the Second Coming are not advancing at all. Yet there are ineffaceable types of spiritual life; the Seven Churches picture them; with the perception of these given us, we can contribute to a goal which we cannot afford not to make ours, too, if we will stand

with others in what is one with us all, spiritual life, and with Christians' spiritual life in God the Saviour Jesus Christ, and see it expressed in its types, in its varieties, in its stages of development, in its present imperfections, in its differences of doctrine.

The effort of this essay is after a fuller loyalty to the doctrines of the New Church, loyalty to them not simply as true and Divine teaching, but loyalty to them first as the way of our own growth and as the means of the world's advance in spiritual life. Let our aim individually and in the activities of the Church be experience of spiritual life, for which the doctrines themselves stand, and out of which they have come, and we shall have a deeper realization of spiritual life in us; we shall speak to the world not just from a knowledge of the doctrines but out of the possession of spiritual life; we shall possess in ourselves an absorbing zeal and earnestness, such as what is directly experienced and no most perfect teaching can engender; and we shall find the doctrines touching the world with the tang and force of the reality which is behind them so used.

WILLIAM F. WUNSCH.

TWO FUNCTIONS OF THE CHURCH.

THERE are, in general, two functions of the Lord's Church, which are universally recognized. The one is that of the evangelist or missionary, the other, that of the priest or pastor. The one has for its purpose the proclamation of new truth, or the revival of fresh interest in truth already accepted. The other seeks to build up and strengthen the Church on the foundations which have been previously laid. The first is primarily a process of birth, and the second a process of growth and development. So distinct are these two functions, and for such different qualifications do they call, that they can seldom be equally well performed by the same person. One who is most successful in the missionary field is often ill-adapted to pastoral work. Those who have been noted as preachers or exhorters have frequently failed in reaping any lasting fruit from their labors. The reverse is likewise true. The faithful and devoted shepherd of a spiritual flock may not attract wide attention in his pulpit ministrations. Yet both kinds of service are necessary; and both are justly required of most men who hold the priestly office.

The Divine Word abounds in passages which suggest this twofold duty of the Church. In Old Testament times the terms in which it often found expression were priest and prophet. Through the priesthood, instituted by the law of Moses, the modes of worship, mostly sacrificial, were established for the Israelites. In this way their relation to the Lord was openly and steadily maintained. But from time to time arose prophets, with their messages of warning and instruction. These, in the Lord's name, gave notice of impending dangers, and recalled the people to their allegiance. They were the teachers and evangelists of their day and generation. Watchmen on the

walls of Jerusalem, as they were sometimes called, they are said to have blown their trumpets, and awakened their brethren to the need of a higher faith and life.

Likewise, when the Lord was born into the world, the same double necessity continued. Notice the various directions which He gave to His disciples. In the first place, He called them from their nets and fishing-boats, saying, "Henceforth ye shall catch men." They would, in other words, be instrumental in establishing His Church by gathering converts into it. So too, when He sent forth the twelve, whom He named apostles, He commanded them, among other things, to preach the glad tidings that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. And, again, after His resurrection, His final commission to them was, "Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you." Thus are brought together nearly all the peculiar functions of the Church,—to make disciples everywhere, to administer the sacraments, to teach the way of everlasting life. The Lord Himself set the example, except that He did not personally baptize. He preached the Gospel of the kingdom and exhorted men to repentance. He taught in the synagogues and temple. The apostles, when He was no longer outwardly present with them, carried on and perpetuated His work. For had He not promised them, "Lo, I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the age?" In His name they published the new gospel of Christian truth. In His name also they sought to live, and to help others live, in the light of that truth.

When we come to the teachings of the New Church on this subject, we find essentially the same instruction. "The Church is where the Word is, and where by means of the Word the Lord is known" (Heavenly Doctrine, n. 246). To the Church, Divine truth is revealed, and through her agency the knowledge of it is kept alive. The Church was designed to be the Lord's kingdom on earth, and is such, so far as she lives under His influence. But the Church

may become corrupt. Her truth may be perverted and falsified. She may be purely external,—a mere mass of outward forms and ceremonies. There may be no heart of real goodness in her. She may be “a whited sepulchre,” beautiful in natural appearance, but inwardly “full of dead men’s bones and of all uncleanness.” So the need of the two functions never ceases. There is always occasion for going into all the world, and preaching the gospel to every creature. There is always occasion for learning the Lord’s truth more and more, in order that it may be faithfully practised.

How significant is the definition given us of the priestly office! Thus we read: “As regards priests, they must teach men the way to heaven, and also lead them” (*Ibid.*, n. 315). The purpose for which the Church exists, and for which religious instruction is needful, is here declared. The Divine message must be given, not as mere abstract propositions, but in its relation to human beings. It should aim to lift their thoughts above this world, to make spiritual things real to them, and to quicken their eternal aspirations. Those who are charged with these duties should keep them ever in view. It is not enough that they should teach; they must teach the way to heaven. Nor is it enough to teach the way to heaven; they must lead men to walk in it. Moreover, “they must teach from the Word according to the doctrine of their church.” So doing, they will teach from the Lord, and not from themselves. “Priests who teach truths, and by means of them lead to good of life and thus to the Lord, are good shepherds of the sheep. But those who teach and do not lead to good of life, are evil shepherds.” (*Ibid.*, n. 315.)

The substance of this instruction is, that in the genuine order of man’s development the first thing is to learn what is Divinely true, and the second is to love and do what is Divinely good. The former process is mainly intellectual, and the latter vital. The former is for the sake of the latter. Unless there be in it the manifest purpose of teaching and leading in the way to heaven, it is vain and fruitless.

Too often such has been its character. Too often there have been evil shepherds. Many are the instances in which the Church's growth has not advanced beyond the teaching stage. To know certain doctrines and to profess belief in them has been openly declared all-sufficient. In short, one of the avowed tenets of large bodies of Christian worshippers has been the dogma of salvation by faith alone. This is the same as saying that what was intended only as a means for establishing the church has been mistaken for the living Church itself.

Another approach to our subject can be made by considering the two ways in which the Church numerically increases. Her growth may be from without or from within. She may gain accessions from those unacquainted with her teachings, or may be replenished from those born and brought up under her influence. Both sources of supply are, as we have seen, legitimate. We cannot dispense with either of them. But it is important that they should be viewed in their proper relation to each other. Appealing, as they do, to different states of mind, or, it may be, to different periods of spiritual progress, they are liable to receive unequal degrees of attention. Undue emphasis may be laid on the one or the other. They may be made to appear in strong contrast, or treated even as antagonistic.

It is indeed natural for one who has lately come into a knowledge of the heavenly doctrines, to feel, in his enthusiasm, that nothing more is necessary than to publish them throughout the world, in order that they may be universally accepted. To him they seem so clear and reasonable, that he takes for granted that they must be equally convincing to others. In his opinion the simple affirmation of them is enough to ensure belief. So the sounding of the trumpet becomes the one absorbing duty and interest. No other voice is heeded but that of the herald. If he can obtain a hearing, and especially a favorable one, it is deemed sufficient. Nothing more, it is assumed, remains to be done. But sooner or later it begins to be seen that this is only a partial view. One who advocates it has

merely arrived at the point of learning a little of the truth. Before him lies the greater and endless task of living it. The crucial test is yet to be applied. Does he love it well enough to deny himself on its account? Unless he does, he will, after a while, find himself growing luke-warm; and the zeal which was at first so ardent, will gradually disappear.

Hence it follows that those who affiliate themselves with the visible church do not always permanently stay there. It is one thing to be gathered into the flock, and another to be faithful and persevering members of it. Conversion, to use the common term, is only the beginning of religious experience; but, alas, if it be also the end! We are here reminded of the parable of the sower, and especially of the seeds which fell upon stony places, concerning which it is said that "forthwith they sprung up, because they had no deepness of earth; and when the sun was up, they were scorched; and because they had no root, they withered away." Or, as explained by the Lord Himself: "He that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it, yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for a while: for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended."

Accordingly there must be active influences at work within the Church herself, if her life is to be real and abiding. Having come into existence, she will continue in existence only by her own faithful efforts. The original impulse which gave her birth will not forever keep her alive. Like an individual human being, so this larger man, the collective Church, needs to have her strength renewed by constant nourishment. That nourishment is the truth applied to daily life. The missionary has done his part; and now the pastor must put forth his best endeavors to make its effects lasting. Or, to use more general terms, the interest has been aroused; now must it not be suffered to die out. This, henceforth, is our primary obligation. Yea, more. We must not feel content unless the interest

increases. In spiritual matters nothing is so dangerous as stagnation. A church which is not making progress is falling back. Of what use is it to attract into the fold a few persons from the outside, if our own children are slipping away from it? How fatal therefore is the mistake of thinking that the only, or even the principal, sign of a church's prosperity is the accession of new members from beyond her borders! A far stronger position is held by the church which never loses a member, but grows steadily from generation to generation, being re-inforced from the ranks of those to whom her teachings have proved themselves essential through living experience.

Thus is the inside growth of the Church a point never to be lost sight of. It is the one factor in her development, which is always indispensable. Without it there can be no stability or permanency. We wish to draw new believers into our body; but in order to do so, we must have an active and efficient body into which to draw them. Mere agreement on certain dogmas will attract no one into earnest fellowship with others. Only the recognition of a common purpose, with indomitable courage in pursuing it, will accomplish this result. That purpose, in the Church, must be, as has been shown, devotion to her principles, for the sake of living them. Where this kind of interest is wanting and the Church is suffering for lack of it, we cannot expect her to be a place in which one cares to live. Men do not long continue to pour water into the bunghole, if they see it running to waste out of the spigot.

And yet, although it be acknowledged that the upbuilding and conservation of the Church within herself are of supreme importance, there still remains a danger, against which we must be on our guard. Especially if outward conditions are flourishing, it is possible that we may become too well satisfied with things as they are. We may too complacently enjoy our comforts and privileges, unmindful that this kind of enjoyment is no better than any other selfish pleasure. If over-indulged, it has the tendency to foster a certain pride of superiority, which retards

spiritual progress. An element of weakness enters, which hastens the Church's downfall. If we seek for an example, it can be easily afforded by the Roman-Catholic hierarchy, which, as we know, is visibly strong and powerful out of all proportion to its genuine inner life. In this manner any church organization may insensibly decline, being outwardly grand and imposing, but rotten at the core.

There is no subject on which Swedenborg speaks more emphatically than on the internals and externals of the Church, as distinguished from each other. From the point of view which he gives, nothing can be more important than to discriminate plainly between them. Thus in the little work entitled "The New Jerusalem and its Heavenly Doctrine" we read as follows in the chapter on Piety:

It is believed by many that a spiritual life, or the life which leads to heaven, consists in piety, in a holy external, and in renunciation of the world. But piety without charity, and a holy external without a holy internal, and renunciation of the world without life in the world, do not make spiritual life; but piety from charity, a holy external from a holy internal, and renunciation of the world with life in the world, *do* make it.

Piety is to think and speak piously, to spend much time in prayer, to bear one's self humbly at that time, to attend church and listen devoutly to the preaching there, to go often in the year to the sacrament of the Supper, and to observe in like manner the other duties of worship according to the regulations of the Church. But the life of charity is to will well and do well to the neighbor, to act from justice and equity in every work, and likewise from good and truth in every function. In a word, the life of charity consists in performing uses. In this life of charity Divine worship primarily consists, but in the life of piety secondarily. He, therefore, who separates the one from the other, that is, he who leads a life of piety, and not of charity at the same time, does not worship God. From this it may be evident that a life of piety separate from a life of charity is not the spiritual life which must be in Divine worship. (Heavenly Doctrine, nn. 123, 124.)

These are strong words, and not every one may at first grasp their full import. So accustomed are we to think of the forms of worship as being true worship itself, that we do not easily throw off that great fallacy. We may imag-

ine that we do, but in heart we too often do not. Listen to another passage:

Worship does not consist in prayers and external devotion, but in a life of charity. Prayers are only its externals, for they go forth from a man through his mouth; consequently men's prayers are such as they themselves are in respect to life. It matters not that a man bears himself humbly, that he kneels and sighs when he prays; these are externals, and unless externals come forth from internals, they are only posturings and sounds without life. In each thing that a man utters there is affection, and every man, spirit and angel is his own affection, for their affection is their life; it is the affection itself that speaks, and not the man without it; therefore such as the affection is, such is the praying. Spiritual affection is what is called charity toward the neighbor; to be in that affection is true worship; praying is what goes forth. From this it can be seen that the essential of worship is a life of charity, and that its instrumental is posture and praying, or that the primary of worship is a life of charity, and its secondary is praying. From this it is clear that those who place all Divine worship in oral piety, and not in practical piety, err greatly. (*Apocalypse Explained*, n. 325.)

Thus forcibly are we taught the nature of true religion. It is the same lesson which fell from the Lord's own lips when He said, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith." Showing what is essential, and what is instrumental, in genuine worship, it gives to each its proper place. It does not discard external ceremonies, on the ground that internal life is so much more important; but it remands them to their own subordinate position. Concerning the deeper and more vital things its teaching is, "These ought ye to have done." Nevertheless we must not forget that it is added, "And not to leave the other undone."

To keep in mind the distinction between the internals and externals of the Church, and to accord to each its relative value, is certainly one of our first duties. Especially is this the case in view of the fact that the new Christian Church whose exponents we aspire to be, is of a more interior character than any which have preceded her since the time of the

Jewish dispensation. Her distinctive revelation is the spiritual sense of the Word. Her peculiar mission is to make spiritual things real, and to free us from the slavery of the senses and of false appearances. Is it not therefore of transcendent importance that the life which is above nature, and the precious treasures of the soul, should stand forth in our minds with vivid clearness and with all their high significance, as compared with the influence which mere natural interests and earthly objects of desire exert over us? Who shall apply to the affairs of the Church the true standards of measurement, if we do not? So, when at any time, we consider her condition and needs, let us first take account of her spiritual state; let us chiefly inquire into the quality of her love and faith. There may be occasions when she can be helped by more efficient organization, by changes in modes of worship, or by other outward expedients; and these things are not to be neglected. But in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the trouble is more deeply seated; it is the internal church, and not the external, which demands a remedy. A striking illustration of this fact is furnished by the recent book, which every one has been reading. Its name, "The Inside of the Cup," tells its story. Describing a church body which is seemingly sound and vigorous, it shows it to be honey-combed with corruption. Hence, through the wide interest which the book has excited, a large part of the community is seriously asking the fundamental questions, "What is Christianity? What is it doing for the world today, to justify its further existence?"

There is one point in connection with our general subject, which must always be kept in mind. Men are never regenerated in the mass. As each individual is born separately on earth, so is each one separately born again. It does not follow that because a father shuns evils as sins against God, and opens his heart to Divine influences, his son will do likewise. The father's good life will help to diminish the son's evil tendencies, and make it easier for him to resist temptation. But no man can fight another's

spiritual battles for him. I cannot repent for you, nor you for me. So none of us will ever behold the spectacle of a whole generation, or of a collective body of human beings, coming simultaneously into the full true order of their lives. For this reason the two functions of the Church are always needing to be exercised. There are always those whose religious life has not been awakened, those in immature and adolescent stages, and those already far advanced toward heaven. According to their respective states each must be, as far as possible, provided for. But they all live, in this world, side by side with each other. Passing into the world beyond, they come to their eternal homes. Their preliminary work is done; and, if it is well done, they keep growing in goodness and wisdom forever, on the foundations established by it. "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." Such is the Divine order of progression. In this way a man is made, whose measure is that of an angel.

JAMES REED.

NEW-CHURCH PROPAGANDA.*

IN view of the need universally recognized among us to devise more efficient methods of giving the New-Church message to the world, it was decided at the February, 1914, meeting of the ministers of the Massachusetts Association to appoint a Committee on Propaganda consisting of three members, who should give a preliminary study to the general question and report at an early meeting. The committee appointed now reports as follows:

We desire to say in beginning, that we believe this effort to devise more effective methods of presenting New-Church truth to the world results from a clearly indicated impulse from the Divine Providence, since the need of it is manifest to us all, and the desire to go forward has been impressed upon many hearts. We do not feel that our effort is a criticism upon past methods; but, just as in armies there is a time to stand still and a time to advance, so there is a time when the Lord would have His Church relatively stand still, because of the necessity to allow time for certain processes of preparation to be accomplished, and there is a time when He would have it press forward with enthusiasm. We feel that the time has come when the Lord would have us go forward to battle in His name and in His strength.

As the members of this association are ministers, the most natural analysis of the situation would be from the viewpoint of the minister, and this we believe would result in dividing the field of our work into two parts, namely, our own parishes and the outside world. Thus our problem is,

* Report of the Committee on Propaganda Appointed by the Ministers of the Massachusetts Association of the New Church at the Meeting of February 2, 1914.

first, to reach our own parishes and community, and second, to reach the outside world.

It is entirely obvious that the solution of our problem should begin at home in our own churches and in our own towns. The people to be reached are those in our own local churches, those in other churches, and those outside of the churches. These represent in a lesser form the world at large, and the classes to be reached.

Let us consider first the most important problem from the point of view of the pastor, namely, his own congregation. This divides itself up into three groups, namely, the children of the Sunday School, the young people of the League, and the recognized adults of the Church.

We believe that the supreme object of the Sunday School is to prepare children to become Christians. We feel that if our work in the Sunday School is properly done, practically every child will surely and naturally enter into the life of the Church, which ought to be the life of complete obedience to the Lord's commandments, and necessarily involves regeneration and missionary effort. This end is not now accomplished in our Sunday Schools. Many children do enter into this life of the Church from the Sunday School, but a very large number do not. The methods to be adopted to bring about the desired end we believe will vary, but in general the principle involved will be to teach them reverently, prayerfully, and lovingly the Word of God in the light of the New Age, praying for them and working with them to choose as of themselves the life of religion. We should never forget that the choosing by them of the life of religion depends primarily upon the Lord's power, and that this power is available for them through our instrumentality by our own contact with the Lord through the Word and through prayer. While the basis of our study with them should be the Word of God, at the same time it must be brought home to them that the New Church represents an entirely new interpretation of religion to the world, that it is indeed the Lord's Second Coming whereby all things have become new.

To accomplish the desired results with the young people, we believe that the process should be similar to that followed in the Sunday School, but with additional emphasis upon the beauty and power of the Word of God in the sense of the letter, and with additional emphasis upon the distinctive interpretations of the Word of God rendered possible through the Lord's Second Coming. Both the young people and the children should be made to realize that the New Church stands for something new in the history of religion. It is not desirable, in our opinion, that we should make sectarians in the narrow denominational sense, and yet it is indispensable, if the distinctive character of the New Church is to be promulgated to an age dissatisfied with former irrational dogmas, and unsatisfied because of the non-realization of Christian ideals of character, that our children and young people should be made to understand that the Lord has now given to the world something better in the way of religious teaching than it has ever had before, something distinctively new.

But our teaching must be so based upon the literal sense of the Word of God that our children and young people will honor the Word as the dwelling-place of the Lord on earth, recognizing it as the medium through which alone we can come into personal contact with Him, and from which we are to derive spiritual power. It is also desirable that our teachings should be of such a nature that it will become possible for them to demonstrate to others from the letter of the Word that our distinctive teachings are based entirely upon it; this will fix their feet firmly upon the Rock of Ages.

There is still another characteristic which our teachings should possess—it should be entirely possible and easy for children and young people not of the New Church coming into our Sunday Schools, Bible classes and League meetings to understand from the common ground of the Word, with which we may assume that they are more or less acquainted, the things that we are discussing, to perceive the complete reasonableness of our teachings, and to be attracted to them. Even though we are compelled to advert to and make use

of the writings of Swedenborg as the revelator of the New Age, we must learn to do so in such a manner that all may clearly perceive that the authority for what we teach is not that Swedenborg has said that the thing is so, but that the Lord has revealed it in the Word in doctrines which derive their authority, not from anything human, but from their very reasonableness—a reasonableness resulting from their inherent truth. We perceive the doctrines to be true because they are entirely in accord with reason; they are reasonable because true, and true and reasonable because they are of God. Thus we show the doctrines to be true because they are the only possible rational interpretations of the Word of God.

We are now confronted by the problem of the adults of the Church. We feel that in general any Christian should be able to come into our morning and evening services on Sunday and find himself at home. He should not, in other words, be estranged by technical New-Church terms which to him are unintelligible, nor offended by what we have learned to call “doctrinal” sermons, distinguished by frequent reference to and quotations from our books of theology. We believe that the distinctive doctrines of the New Church should always be taught, but taught in such a way that they will not offend either nominal New-Church people or strangers, taught so attractively, so reasonably, so powerfully that no one earnest in his desire to know the truth can take offence. As far as possible, we should avoid referring to the New Church in the denominational sense of the term. If we visit a Baptist or a Methodist church, we do not like to hear the word “Baptist” or “Methodist” thrust upon our attention. We expect to hear the word “Christian” and to hear the Word of God expounded. It is just as offensive to others to visit our churches and hear the New Church referred to in its denominational sense, or spoken of as the only one possessing truth, or as the only one containing Christians. We want to win a hearing and patient consideration of our teachings on the broad grounds that they are the Lord’s and for all His

children, rather than that they are the peculiar property of what others consider a new religious sect. In other words, we want to preach the True Christian Religion, and have others see from reason and common sense that it is the True Christian Religion—thus, that it is for all Christians. This will bring men and women more quickly into our outward organization than any narrow presentation of our truths in which the impression is given that these truths are the property of a new religious sect. Therefore, in public presentations of our doctrines where strangers are present, it is better to make use of the term "New Age," or of "The Lord's Revelations to the New Age," rather than of the term "New Church." The impression produced of narrowness or denominationalism will always injure us.

A criticism has been made of our church services that they appeal only to two classes of people, namely, the man with the philosophical mind, and the woman with the Episcopalian disposition. We realize that in a general way this is true, but we feel that there is nothing inherently wrong in reaching the thoughtful man and the devout woman. We are sure that we must appeal to both classes, to intelligence and to affection, but we believe that we should learn to make our appeal in a more popular way and to more general audiences. Our sermons should not be only for the man familiar with New-Church ways of thinking and speaking, and our services should not be only for the special class of people who delight in ritualism. While unity or uniformity is highly desirable in many ways and in many things, the New Church should not necessarily be classed as ritualistic or coldly intellectual. There should be room for the more informal modes of worship popular with large classes as well as for the ritualism of Episcopalianism, and for the emotionalism of Methodism as well as for the more intellectual appeal of Presbyterianism. The effort to bring about uniformity is sometimes destructive of better things than uniformity. It has resulted in the narrowness of all religions and in the religious persecutions of the world. Since in extreme forms it has in the past brought about the Spanish Inquisition

and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, we should be careful ourselves in urging it, lest we be guilty of attempting to impose upon the world the things which appeal to our own temperament as essential things of religion. In other words, the world should understand that the New Church is not necessarily ritualistic nor inherently coldly intellectual, but is the Lord's message to all sorts and conditions of men. The New Church should be broad enough to cover the temperaments and capacities of all.

We believe that the effort of all our preaching should be to establish the intimate personal relationship between the individual soul and the Lord Jesus Christ as a Person. He should be ever in our thoughts as a positive objective reality. Swedenborg has taught us that we cannot think of Him in any other way. If we are content with God as merely a general Principle, as Love, or Power, our thoughts will diffuse themselves in space, and we shall really have no personal God at all upon whom to fix our affections and thoughts. We often talk abstractly of the necessity of God's concentering Himself in time and space in the human form in order that we might be able to apprehend Him; but to many New-Churchmen now He is only a general Principle, far-off, vague and impersonal. The vision of Him as He appeared to John in the Apocalypse will be helpful and stimulating. It will enable us to get something of that sense of intimate personal relationship which many of our Protestant brethren seem at times to possess, and which we are taught is religion itself. These suggestions may possibly seem at first thought out of place in this paper, but we believe that in order to be successful in our propaganda we must not only have ourselves clear views of the Lord as a reality, living, vital and personal, but that we must be forever endeavoring to bring our hearers to the Lord in an intimate personal way, and that this is indispensable to our success.

We feel that the doctrine of the Lord as the one only God of heaven and earth should be proclaimed from our pulpits and proved from the literal sense of the Word. It will do

more to help our fellow-Christians of other denominations to place their theology on a solid foundation than anything else. As Swedenborg¹ has so justly shown, the entire development of a religion depends upon its conception of God. Starting out with an incorrect idea of God, all that follows is necessarily incorrect, false and hurtful. Hence, it should be the primary thing of our work in the pulpit to promulgate correct ideas of the Lord.

We have many doctrines to preach, and all are useful, but we should be careful to maintain a unity and simplicity in all our preaching, so that our hearers may not be confused by truth presented from many angles; they should always be able to recognize the great essential outlines, the general principles of our religion. We believe that it is useful, for example, to keep before them the thought that religion is the personal relationship, with its resultant life, between the individual soul and the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. We may phrase it as the acknowledgment of the Lord and the life according to the commandments, or as the conjunction of man with the Lord; but some such simple definition of religion should be kept constantly in the mind. The reason we emphasize this point is that it is so easy to get away from the essentials of religion and lose ourselves in a multiplicity of details. This tendency has been characteristic of all religions and helps to render the good in all of them powerless. The devils must rejoice when they can divert us from the important things and get us profoundly interested in unimportant things.

Possibly one of the reasons why we do not reach the people of our communities more widely with our message is that we do not adapt it to their needs. We preach the things that interest us personally, things that interest men who live in a theological library, and while they may be and are helpful to some others, yet a better plan would seem to be to study the needs of mankind from their viewpoints, and then try to give them the help the New Church alone can bring. In other words, we need to become more intimately related to the world in which we live, and accommodate our mes-

sage to toiling, troubled men and women, overwhelmed with problems they do not know how to solve.

For example, we forget that men and women are tempted, many of them tempted beyond the point of endurance, and we preach theology rather than practical help. We are too apt to think of the people in our churches as men and women who lead decorous lives and are not sorely tempted. With them in our minds we preach only to the needs that appear on the surface. We forget that most people are enslaved by sin, even many who go to church on Sundays, and that none of us escapes temptation. We need to know how to be saved from evil.

We know that a gospel has been preached to the world for the salvation of sinners which has helped to the extent that it has brought men into a personal relationship with the Lord; but it has been filled with falsities, and, even though it has resulted, by the mercy of the Lord, in the establishment of some kind of personal relationship with Him—a relationship which has been the source of the salvation obtained—it has been altogether false in its statements and ideals and emphasis. It has been the doctrine of faith alone. A recent statement of it in the Protestant Magazine will recall it to our minds:

Justification by faith in the merits and atoning work of Christ, apart from the works of the flesh, is a fundamental truth of the Gospel. Such justification may be apprehended directly by the faith of the repentant sinner. The one true sacrifice for sin was offered on Calvary when Christ died for our sins. The merits of Christ are the only and sufficient ground for the sinner's acceptance with God.

This is the gospel that the world knows as vital religion. This is the best that the Christian ministry has hitherto had to offer to mankind. It is what is offered today, "faith in the merits and atoning work of Christ." It is the old doctrine of substitution of the vicarious atonement, with all the emphasis placed upon a free pardon, which becomes the equivalent of salvation, and no emphasis placed upon a

reformation of character through the processes of regeneration.

Men are here and now suffering, even on this earth, the torments of hell, because of their bondage to devils. The Lord came into the world to set men free from the bondage to the hells. Because of His redemptive work they are free. It is only necessary for men to assert this freedom in the light of the knowledge of this redemption which the New Church is able satisfactorily to demonstrate, and men can become free. They can and do become free as they realize this freedom, as they hear the Lord's voice calling to them, "Fear not; for I have redeemed thee," and as they look to Him as their Saviour. It is completely effective. It actually saves men from the power of evil habits, from the power of devils. Some of us are preaching this New Gospel, the gospel destined to set the world free from the tyranny of the hells.

We should not fancy that this is a mere incidental theme for us as preachers of the Word of God in this New Age. It is in some ways our most important message to the world, the one it needs most acutely. For men are dying in their sins. They need help, and we have the help they need. You and I perhaps do not give much thought to the secret lives of men, to their vices; but when we read the reports of vice commissions we then get a glimpse of the underworld which is disconcerting. We cannot perhaps determine what percentage of men indulge in secret vice; but it is very obvious that the large majority are yielding to this evil in one form or another. For them there is no other help than this New Gospel, but it is ample even for this evil. By means of a knowledge of their actual redemption, and by their reliance upon the Lord, they may become absolutely free from the power of devils. Even the terrible evil of drunkenness may be cured by it. Indeed there is no evil which cannot be overcome by the application of this remedy. The world needs this knowledge, needs it desperately. What are we doing to give it to them? Are we not in a sense like the priest and the Levite of the parable, ignoring the existence of this dire

need of men and passing by unheeding on the other side?

If we preach our New Gospel in all its phases and learn to apply the truths of the New Age in a living way to the problems of our times, we believe that it will be possible to reach our community as well as the nominal adherents of the New Church. We believe that such preaching will reach the people of the other churches—the ministers as well; and that we shall see the men and women and children of our towns and cities alive to our message, and eventually many of them worshipping and working with us in the proclamation of the Lord's Second Coming.

Now let us consider the work of reaching with our message the world outside of our parishes and communities. This is a vast theme in itself. We believe that the instrumentalities to be used are: 1. Personal talks of the New-Church men and women with their friends and neighbors and chance acquaintances; 2. Sermons of the type we have already outlined; 3. Public lectures; 4. Newspaper articles; 5. Magazine articles; 6. Tracts and pamphlets; 7. Books.

In regard to the first instrumentality mentioned, we find that the investigation conducted some years ago disclosed the fact that personal conversations have led more people into the New Church than any other one thing. We know that Christianity spread in its beginnings very largely through personal propaganda.

How can we avail ourselves of this vast but relatively unused force to extend the knowledge of the New Church? Through organization of the people already New-Churchmen. How may this be effected? By inducing them to follow the methods of business men who try to interest others in the articles they have to sell. For example, a piano salesman, or an insurance agent has a list of prospective purchasers, to which he is constantly adding. He looks over his list every day and studies the most effective means to influence his customers that day. He sets aside a certain number that should be communicated with in some manner, and he strives to speak the word or send the message that will be helpful in bringing about the end desired. This method

is followed by business houses everywhere in these modern days. Possibly every prospective purchaser does not buy a piano, or an insurance policy, or the other article, whatever it may be, that is for sale, but this is the most efficient method to reach him.

Now this plan we believe is perfectly proper for New-Churchmen, and will be found tremendously effective, especially if the names of those we wish to influence be taken to the Lord daily in prayer. Prayer will bring results that nothing else will bring. Prayer will turn people to the Lord who may seem to us hopeless. This method will quicken the individuals of the church, for they are in this way learning to love others as the Lord loves them, and thus keep His new commandment. And it will result in a spiritual activity in the lives of those labored and prayed for that will almost intoxicate us with joy. It is one of the best and most effective methods of arousing such activity, and should be begun at once in every church.

We have already treated of the messages which we should strive to take to men from the pulpit. Many of these, because of their new adaptation to the needs of men, will be useful as missionary tracts.

In the matter of public lectures, we can learn much from the activity of men like Pastor Russell and those associated with him in the propaganda of their impossible literalism, and also from Christian Scientists, who are certainly successful in their propaganda. They all work with a confidence and energy that should shame us. The lecture courses in the Washington church, in the Philadelphia church and elsewhere, as well as our own recent lecture courses in New England should aid us. The way that the Rev. Julian K. Smyth is advertising the new lectures he is delivering is significant; for example, "Could God Write a Book?" "Could God Become Man?" "Can Man Discover Immortality?" The way these subjects are put indicates a very determined purpose to reach the world with our message in a more effective way than has been done before. It indicates an endeavor to meet the modern attitude of mind. Mr. Smyth's

Western lecture tour is well worthy of study. We would advocate the establishment of a lecture bureau which would have as its work the securing of available men to deliver public lectures, and also the arrangement of such lectures in various fields, men whose presentation of the truth will attract the public and carry our message in a dignified but effective way. We need the aggressiveness and the enthusiasm of propagandists in the other fields we have mentioned, and the Church everywhere should stand behind their efforts.

In the matter of newspaper articles, it is possible in every community for ministers and laymen to attract the attention of the public by letters and articles in regard to subjects of general interest seen in the light of the New Age. Our people should be encouraged to do this as far as they can do it satisfactorily. In every church men and women should be requested to undertake such work. Naturally discrimination should be used in pressing such invitations.

There should be a committee especially in charge of the work of getting articles for and into magazines and other periodicals. Opportunities should be sought, needs studied, and articles obtained which are accommodated to those needs. This is a most important work and requires constant attention. It would obviously influence thinking men and women who are comparatively unacquainted with the New Church, and would accomplish great good if wisely and prayerfully undertaken.

When we come to the question of tracts or pamphlets, we are aware that we are arriving at the domain of New-Church organizations already at work. We do not want to do their work for them, but we would coöperate with them and we believe that they would welcome our suggestions and be delighted to work with us. We do not question their earnestness nor their intelligence when we offer to work with them; we are sure that they feel the need and value of suggestions from others interested in getting our message to the world in this way, and realize that a wider realization of needs results from the interest of a larger number.

We need new books as well as new tracts, and a committee should be appointed to procure them. The subjects would naturally be those adapted to accommodate our teachings to the modern attitude of mind, and will be indicated on a subsequent page.

We would suggest the desirability of having the work of every committee that may be named open to us all through constant reports of activity. In naming committees we do not wish to pigeonhole the work outlined, but to have it studied by smaller groups, and also to specialize it. We consider it indispensable that the various activities should be kept alive by being kept in constant touch with us all.

We have notable people who might be induced to write for us. If novels could be written for us like the "Inside of the Cup," it would be a great achievement. We understand that Marie Corelli has become a New-Church woman. She has a wide public. Whatever critics may say of her books, she influences multitudes and what she writes is read the world over. Despite her defects she is a woman of genius, and we believe that if it is true that she is a New-Church woman our English brethren might help us to induce her to present certain of our teachings to the world in popular form. We believe that Ella Wheeler Wilcox could be induced to write of certain of our teachings, and also Edwin Markham. Others would occur to us as we studied this field.

In general we desire to reach the outside world as follows :

1. By helping theological students and other religious workers to answer their theological problems. Some of the books and tracts designed for them would also be useful with ministers, but in general we believe that ministers need more thorough treatment of subjects than younger men, who are oftentimes merely trying to get a satisfactory working basis and sufficient inspiration and confidence to go ahead.

2. By helping ministers in their theological problems. We feel that possibly the most effective work of propaganda today is already being done through the gift books which are being distributed far and wide, and the "follow-up" work of the New-Church Theological School; but we believe

that new collateral writings might be prepared which would more effectively open the way to the serious study of Swedenborg. The world of religious teachers wants light upon its problems. They want a doctrine of the Lord which will be able to withstand criticism from whatever source. Our teachings will enable them to accept rationally the Virgin Birth. They will help them to understand how God could write a book, and we believe they will welcome, when they perceive its value, what we have to offer.

3. We want books and tracts to help young men in college and out of college, but we believe that these classes can be reached best by lectures.

4. We believe that we should strive particularly to get our message to the scientific world, and that we should have men like Prof. Browne of Cornell and Prof. Very work together to meet this need, which they understand better than others.

5. We also want to reach the philosophical world by magazine articles, pamphlets and books.

6. We also want to reach the teachers in the world of thought, for example, the higher critics, by specially prepared articles and books.

May we say a word in closing as to the general principles which should guide us in all our work? We believe that there should be certain definite ideas back of what we strive to do. We would suggest:

1. That we assume that the world needs help, and also desires it. Our constant aim should be to study how best we can give the help it wants.

2. That we study the point of view of every class in order properly to reach it; in other words, to give it the help it needs in a way that it will welcome. Without careful study of the viewpoint of others we shall almost certainly fail. Our effort must be to accommodate, to adapt our message, to bridge over the gap between us and the world, and this we cannot do unless we have our side of the bridge on a level with their side.

3. That we accommodate our language as well as our

thought to the average understanding, avoiding New-Church terms as far as possible.

4. That we proceed upon the assumption that the only authority is the reasonableness of the truth. Even if our message is from the Lord, or rather because it is from Him, the sign and seal of its Divine character is its reasonableness.

5. That we emphasize the newness of our message; in other words, take as our watchword, "Behold, I make all things new."

WALTER B. MURRAY.

THE RELATION OF MAN AND WOMAN.*

To say, as so many people do, that the present age is an unthinking one, would express only a half-truth. In religious matters, the minds of most of the men and women of today are unquestionably but little exercised; thinking along these lines has been so long and so persistently discouraged by the corrupted church that it has almost died of inanition. But even here there are signs of an awakening, as may be seen by the wide-spread circulation and discussion of such novels as "The Inside of the Cup," or "The Way Home." The greatest activity of modern thought, however, is found in other fields. It is with scientific and sociological problems—above all with the latter—that the most of our intelligent fellow-citizens feel themselves chiefly concerned.

That this is so, the briefest survey of contemporary literature, or even of the plays of the better class of theatres, will be sufficient to convince us. In the general re-adjustment of the conditions of human life, which the New Age is bringing about, almost all traditional social relations are being criticized, and to some extent modified. This is par-

* The writer hopes that it will not appear to any of his readers, that he thinks that all, or even most, of the present public activities of women are useless and disorderly. In almost every field of human activity women have done work within recent years which any man must be ignorant to belittle, and beyond measure narrow-minded not to admire with heartiness and humility. The scope and splendor of that work may be realized from a perusal of such a book, for instance, as that of Miss Ida M. Tarbell, entitled "The Business of Being a Woman." But the present paper, on its negative side, is intended to deal with an activity—by no means confined to women—which is neither admirable nor orderly; and it is in relation to that activity alone that the writer would wish his critical statements to be considered.

ticularly true of the relation of government and the governed, of that of capital and labor, and—infinity most important of all—of that of man and woman. I say “most important” because, while all other social relations concern many of us but indirectly and some of us hardly at all, the relation of man and woman is one which no human being, unless he be a Robinson Crusoe on the island of Juan Fernandez, can avoid.

Now in so far as the problem presented by this last relation is a purely social one, we cannot, of course, expect to find a solution of it in the doctrines of the New Church. It is a law of Divine Order that men shall be left to solve such difficulties for themselves. Divine Revelation does not teach us sociology, any more than it does geology or chemistry or physics. But every social question is also to some extent a spiritual one, inasmuch as a true solution of it must be based upon spiritual principles—those principles of spiritual order which are and must be the foundation of natural order. The objects of the present paper, then, will be to survey in outline the spiritual principles upon which a right relation of man and woman must be based; to criticize, from their stand-point, some modern ideals of that relation; and finally to suggest, not so much the solution of the problem, as the direction in which it may be expected to be found.

But upon what ground do we speak of the relation of man and woman as a “problem”? During all past ages of which we have any knowledge, it has been the most settled of human relations—modified somewhat, it is true, with the lapse of time, but in the main unchanging through wars and revolutions and the rise and fall of empires. It has always been assumed, until now, that the ideal relationship was some form of marriage, and that in marriage there should be a divided responsibility—the woman taking charge of the affairs of the partnership in the home, and the man of its contacts with the outside world. Also, it is but fair to admit, there has always been a greater or less tendency to regard the woman’s work as a little less im-

portant and less praiseworthy than the man's, and herself, in consequence, as somewhat his inferior.

This view, which we may call the traditional one, is unquestionably still held by the majority of people, even in the most enlightened communities; but it is almost equally obvious that at the present time there is a very strong and rapid movement away from it. For this a number of causes are commonly assigned:

There is, first of all, the existence of undoubted abuses arising out of the old order of things. To such a class belong those principles of the common law which regard a wife as her husband's chattel, which deny her right to property, and which do not even recognize her as the parent of her own children. But, in our country at least, such ancient wrongs can have but little to do with present conditions, since most of them have long ago been remedied by statute, and since, in point of fact, the present legal status of a woman is in many respects superior to that of a man. Nor can too serious attention be paid to talk of oppression in the home; for any one who imagines that the average American husband abuses his wife must view his fellow-countrymen with a very jaundiced eye indeed.

There is more plausibility in the explanation which attributes the changing relations of men and women to economic necessity. Women, it is said, whether their place is in the home or not, have been forced to leave the home in order to earn a living. This statement is superficially true, but it is incomplete. Economic causes are not self-existent; they arise from spiritual causes. And there is at least room for serious question whether so large a proportion of women would have sought outside employment for economic reasons if they had not, for deeper reasons, desired to do so. Otherwise, why should it be, for example, that domestic service, which most nearly approximates the traditional occupation of women, and which is at present almost extravagantly profitable, is the most despised of callings, and the only one which is recruited with difficulty?

The truth is that the cause of the present tendency away

from the old ideals is neither social nor economic, but spiritual. It is a part of the general unrest, of the blind, irrepressible groping after better things of a society which has lost its old philosophy of life, and has not yet found anything to take its place. The demand of woman for a new adjustment of her relationship with man is but the natural consequence of this greatest of world-movements.

The most practical embodiment of this demand is the request, so generally and so strenuously made, that women be allowed to share with men the privileges and responsibilities of civil government. To grant this alone would involve as fundamental a change as has ever been made in the organization of human society. But it must not be considered as by any means final. Already there are many "advanced thinkers," both men and women, to whom this change seems trivial. "The gaining of the vote by women," writes W. L. George in an article on "Feminism" in a recent issue of the *Atlantic Monthly*, "is nothing but an affair of outposts." The feminist movement, of which he is one of the leaders, will be satisfied with nothing less than a complete and all-embracing "equality" of woman with man.

Beginning with a frank admission that many of the feminists do not believe it advisable to make all their views publicly known at present—a position whose obvious insincerity he is honest enough strongly to oppose—this writer proceeds, in the article referred to, to outline the condition of society to which he believes the establishment of sex equality would lead.

In the first place, he says, the education of girls and of boys would be made identical, and all occupations—the law, the ministry, even the army, would, in theory at least, be as freely open to women as to men. As a result of this women would acquire complete economic independence, and would be released from the necessity of entering "a state of sex slavery" (*i.e.* marriage) in order to be supported. And so, eventually, the institution of marriage, which the feminists regard as a species of bondage invented by man for the purpose of keeping woman in subjection, would be abolished

altogether. It is, however, admitted that the time is not yet fully ripe for so radical a change. The ideal condition will be that in which all unions will be entirely free, and will continue only during the pleasure of the parties. "Two cases have come to my knowledge," writes Mr. George, "where English women have been prepared to contract alliances with men with whom they did not intend to pass their lives—this because they desired a child. They consider that the child is the expression of the feminine personality, while after the child's birth the husband becomes a mere excrescence."

But we are told that we must not expect from this that the "free" woman will accept motherhood, any more than she will wifehood, as a limitation of her independence. The home, as well as the husband, is eventually to be abolished, and the care of all children to be assumed by the state.

Please do not think that these are the views of one wild visionary. They may be found, more or less similarly expressed, in the works of August Bebel, R. B. Cunningham-Grahame, and, among women, of Ellen Key, Olive Schreiner, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Rosa Mayreder, Mrs. Walter Gallichan and many others; and they appear to underlie, to a much greater extent than many of its own supporters realize, the propaganda of the movement for equal suffrage. Says Mr. George again, "It has been the custom during the suffrage campaign to pretend that women demand merely the vote. The object of this is to avoid frightening the men." It seems, to the writer at least, quite evident that it is but a short, logical step from the demand for political equality of women with men to that for economic equality and independence (indeed, this is a step which many leading suffragists have taken already), and that the next step must be to demand what we may call social equality—the complete release of women from the restrictions and disabilities incident to marriage and motherhood.

In any case, however, whether there be any connection between feminism and the movement for equal suffrage or not, feminism itself is of sufficient importance to deserve our

most serious consideration. It has already a considerable literature, which is being widely read, and it is undoubtedly influencing the thought of thousands of men and women every day.

Now are these feminist ideals the ones which we desire to have prevail in the days of our children or our grandchildren? The old ideals, based, without formal logic, upon sentiment, and the experience of mankind, seem powerless to check their spread. The old ideals are certainly not perfect, but are they radically wrong? And if they are sound at bottom, cannot we find some reasonable ground on which to base our allegiance to them? Can they not even be inspired with a new spirit which will bring back their former power of appeal? Surely, if it can do this, the New Church will be rendering one of the greatest of all possible services to the Christian world. For we know from our Doctrines that upon a right relation of man and woman the state of the Church and the welfare of society alike depend.

Let us accordingly search the Doctrines, and let us examine whatever we can find that is reliable of contemporary knowledge, in the effort to find some principle upon which a solution of the problem of sex relations may be based.

In the first place, the feminists claim that the future relation of man and woman, whatever it may be, shall be based upon absolute equality between them. Now it is an axiom of our school-days that the relation of equality can exist only between like things, or between unlike things in those respects in which they are alike. For example, we may say that one triangle is equal with another, but we cannot say that a triangle is equal with the color blue. Or we can say that the sky is as blue as the sea, but we cannot say that the sky's transparence is equal with the sea's depth. Men and women, therefore, can be equal only in so far as they are alike; and the feminists tell us that they are fundamentally so. In fact the whole feminist philosophy really rests upon a recent biological theory which holds that sex is a purely external attribute of the *genus homo*.

The adherents of this theory claim that, inasmuch as sex

does not exist in the lower forms of life and cannot be distinguished in the earlier stages of the human embryo, and inasmuch, further, as "the male principle may be found in woman and the female principle in man," therefore sex in the human being is simply the accidental result of pre-natal conditions. It follows naturally from this that there is no sex difference in the human mind, and that such differences as appear to exist are due merely to differences in education and environment. Were women, from earliest childhood, given the same training as men they would have the same abilities and the same possibilities.

Now this appears to be a perfectly logical and reasonable conclusion from the premises; but the trouble is that they are quite wrong. In the first place, they are wrong biologically. "The fact is," says Prof. W. T. Sedgwick of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, "that sex, instead of being a comparatively superficial and unimportant difference between men and women, is a deep-seated structural difference, affecting probably every organ, every tissue, and every cell of the human body." The science of psychology, in the person of its leading American exponent, Prof. Hugo Münsterberg, has of late repeatedly told us that sex difference is equally radical in the mental realm. And finally, the doctrines of the New Church inform us that the distinction between man and woman reaches to the very inmosts of the soul; they "are not exactly similar in a single respect" (*Conjugal Love*, n. 33). Whatever, then, the ideal relation between them may be, it cannot possibly be one of equality.

But if man and woman, being fundamentally unlike, cannot possibly be equal, upon what basis can they be associated? Clearly, if they are to work together for the good of society at all, it must be on a basis of mutually supplementing each other. I will not weary my readers with lengthy arguments to show—what to every New-Churchman must be axiomatic—that this supplementing can be truly realized only in monogamous marriage. Upon "free love" even Nature sets the emphatic seal of her disapproval; and if there were no other argument against the feminist

programme in this respect, it would be a sufficient objection that it would result in destroying the race by venereal disease. The coöperation of one husband and one wife must be the basis of any ideal relation of the sexes.

It is obvious, however, that this coöperation cannot extend, in a literal sense at least, into all the details of daily life. There must be a division of duties and responsibilities, and the great practical problem is to decide how such a division is to be wisely made. It will be wisely made only in so far as it allots to each sex those fields of activity for which its fundamental character makes it the better fitted.

Our next step, then, must be to attempt to discover the fundamental characters of man and of woman; and inasmuch as this is a spiritual question, in searching for the answer to it we must leave the realm of science and of human reasoning, and turn to Divine Revelation. From this source—that is to say, from the Scriptures and from the doctrines of the New Church—we learn that the fundamental character of anything may be determined by its cause, or by the spiritual reality to which it corresponds. The deepest knowledge, therefore, which we can have of the nature of man and woman will be that which is gained from an understanding of their respective correspondence.

The first statement of this correspondence which occurs in the Doctrines is in “Arcana Cœlestia,” n. 131, *et seq.*, where the creation of woman is said to represent the granting of *proprium* to man. In the same chapter, *proprium* is defined as the appearance to man that he wills, thinks and acts from himself.

Later we find a different interpretation; for in the story of Abram and Sarai, Abram, as the man, is consistently said to represent good, and his wife, truth. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 2507 *et seq.*)

Still later comes the most familiar statement of all, the one which occurs almost exclusively in the later writings, that a man corresponds to truth and a woman to affection, or good.

The apparent inconsistency of the last two statements

Swedenborg explains, in "Arcana Coelestia," n. 8337 and elsewhere, by telling us that where the Celestial Church is spoken of the husband corresponds to good and the wife to truth, but where the Spiritual Church is the subject the husband corresponds to truth and the wife to good; also that there is a distinction in terms which will tell us in each case which church it is that is referred to.

But in order to reconcile all three explanations and to make the matter entirely clear, we must remind ourselves of a fact which we often forget—the fact that it is Swedenborg's frequent practice in stating correspondences to use a concrete example in the place of an abstract term. A familiar instance of this is his interpretation of "Babylon" in the Book of Revelation as the Roman Catholic Church. And so in the case before us he has given us three examples of the correspondence of man and woman, and has left us to deduce by inference from them what we may call the abstract, or fundamental correspondence. Let us see if we can do this.

If we examine more closely the three statements above cited, we shall find that they possess a fundamental unity. The first, as we saw, interprets woman as *proprium*, or the appearance that a man wills, thinks and acts of himself—in a word, as self-consciousness. Now self-consciousness, which implies sensation and reflection, serves its great use as the *means* by which the self or individual is brought in contact with the world. Without it no activity would be possible.

With men of the Celestial Church good is the inmost or initiative force, and truth or wisdom is employed as the *means* by which goodness effects its purposes. And we are told that in this Church a man corresponds to good and a woman to truth.

In the case of a man of the Spiritual Church, however, the position is reversed. With him the initiative comes from truth, from an ideal. And the will by which he carries it out is not his own internal will, but a "new will," exterior to the truth, which is adjoined to him by the Lord, his own will being incapable of regeneration (Arcana Coelestia, n.

5113). In the case of this Church we are told that man corresponds to truth, and woman to "the affection for truth," that is to this secondary will by *means* of which the truth is put into practice.

Is not the central idea of all these statements sufficiently obvious? They seem, to the writer at least, to show very clearly that the real fundamental correspondence of man is to the initiative principle in activity, and that of woman to the mediate or realizing principle. Or we may put the case in Swedenborg's phraseology and say that man corresponds to "end" and woman to "cause"—the two uniting to produce "effect." And since we know that material relations are true types of spiritual ones, we may find further support for our theory in the fact that this is precisely the position occupied by the respective sexes in their most important physical activity, the propagation of the race. Also, we are told in the Doctrines that the "soul" of a child comes from his father, and the "body" from his mother (*Arcana Coelestia*, n. 6716).

Now if there is anything at all in our doctrine of correspondences, it would seem clear from all this that we must add to our conception of the right relation of man and woman the thought that the true position of woman is as man's "help"—the position which the Scriptures tell us that she was created to occupy (*Genesis*, ii, 18). Accordingly, in all orderly human activities, man will have the function of initiative and guidance; woman, that of development and realization. This is exemplified today in man's highest social achievement, the home, for which he provides, while woman makes his purpose a reality. It is shown also, in a deeper way, in the Church, which, as we are taught, "is first implanted in the man, and through him in the wife" (*Conjugal Love*, n. 63, 125).

But the knowledge which we can gain from correspondences may be made still more specific. We know that the vast majority of people living at the present time are of the spiritual rather than of the celestial genius; and consequently what is said of men and women of the Spiritual Church will

be almost universally true of modern society. In this Church, as we have seen, a man corresponds to truth, and a woman to the affection for that truth. But this is more than an abstract correspondence; it is a practical fact. "Man," we read in "Apocalypse Explained," n. 710, "is born to act from understanding, and woman from affection." And there are many other passages in the Doctrines in which the same truth is affirmed, (*e.g.* *Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 8994; *Heaven and Hell*, n. 368-9; *Conjugal Love*, n. 32-3, etc.). In the face of all this teaching, we of the New Church can hardly do otherwise than affirm the conclusion of experience and common sense, that man is by nature essentially intellectual, and woman volitional or emotional; and that there properly belong to man those duties which involve reason and reflection, and to woman those which depend for their adequate performance rather on love, loyalty and devotion. Let either attempt to usurp the sphere of the other, and there will be complete inefficiency and failure. (Cf. *Conjugal Love*, n. 174-5).

A word in passing on the subject of wifely obedience, which is much debated nowadays. Our doctrines certainly tell us that obedience, in the arbitrary sense of the word, has no place in a true marriage; but it is at least a debatable question whether this teaching implies the creation of an entirely headless household. We read in "*Arcana Cœlestia*," n. 266, that it is a law of spiritual and celestial order that "the wife, who acts from desire, which is of what is her own, rather than from reason like the man, should be subject to his prudence." And in "*Conjugal Love*," n. 291-2 Swedenborg speaks of it as characteristic of wives who are "in the love of domineering" to seek to "reduce their husbands . . . into a state of equality of right with themselves," and also "to insist on their right of equality in law." We know that in the spiritual man truth is nothing without the affection for it, but nevertheless it is by truth, and not by affection or impulse, that the man should be guided. May we not fairly suppose that the analogy holds good in the case of marriage?

In all our thought of the relation of man and woman, however, we must never be tempted to lose sight of the one equality which does exist between them—that is, equality of importance in the scheme of things. The position of initiative and leadership which has been assigned to man may seem on the surface to be more important than that of woman, but in reality this is not the case. Who shall say that a purpose is more important than the means by which it is accomplished; an ideal than the self-mastery which puts it into practice? No; for all that man and woman together accomplish, the one deserves reward and credit equally with the other. We must not forget that it takes a man *and* a woman to make a human being.

We come now to our final endeavor—the attempt to express our conclusions in the terms of ordinary experience. What are the proper spheres of men and of women in practical, daily life? Not long ago a friend remarked to the writer, with some sarcasm, “It would appear from Swedenborg’s teaching that the principal function of a woman is to admire her husband.” The statement is not so absurd as it at first appears. We are told in “Conjugal Love,” n. 88 and elsewhere, (*e. g. Ibid.*, n. 193, 353) that there are two loves proper to man, namely the love of being wise and the love of wisdom (which is, potentially, of his own wisdom). In order that the latter of these loves might not lead him into self-conceit, it was provided by the Lord that a good man should not love his own wisdom directly, but should (unconsciously) love his wife for loving it in him. As a consequence from this it is also said that a man who is in the conceit of his own intelligence cannot experience conjugal love; but that the love of *proprium*, in a good man, is supplanted by love for his wife. Does not this mean, when translated into the terms of ordinary experience, that a man acquires through the consciousness of his wife’s confidence in him that inspiration and that stability of purpose which would otherwise come only through the dangerous medium of self-confidence? And is

it not trite enough to be true that the faith of a good woman has done more to help men to noble achievements than any other power in the world?

As regards actual work, it is possible that changing conditions of society may result in making it necessary for women as well as men to engage in occupations outside the home. But this can never bring about an ideal state of things if it involves the employment of husband and wife in different and independent kinds of business. For, ideally speaking at least, if a woman has a place in an office, it should be in her husband's office—her proper function being, as we have seen, to help him, or, if you please, to coöperate with him in his life work.

But, after all, what is the most important life work of the average man? Is it to perform some great and spectacular service to society? Few of us can hope to do that. Is it not rather to found a home, and through it to rear up children in the fear of the Lord—thereby helping to fulfil the supreme purpose of the Divine Providence, which, as we are told, is a heaven from the human race? It seems as if much of the current objection to the statement that a woman's most important functions are those of a wife and mother would be forestalled if those who make it were more careful to say also that a man's most important functions are those of a husband and father. And, from the point of view of New-Church teaching, the one fact is as incontestable as the other.

It really seems more than probable that one of the greatest causes of the present disorder is that men have entrusted too entirely to women the performance of the highest human functions—of functions in which they should constantly have coöperated, in spirit if not in fact. To a larger extent than many of us realize, women are neglecting the home because men have neglected it, and have neglected to make clear to them its sanctity and importance. Let the average man show a greater interest in home-making, and he will find his wife's interest grow proportionately. But if he regards his home

as in all respects of less importance than his business, his wife can hardly be blamed for feeling that its opportunities are too narrow for her development, and that she must seek an outlet for her activities elsewhere.

Nevertheless, without adopting a censorious attitude toward the modern woman for mistakes which are, after all, as much ours as hers, can we not find a way of doing something to protect her from their consequences? Can we not, for one thing, use our influence and our energies to check the spread of the poisonous doctrines of feminism, which threaten to corrupt the whole body of our social life? It is true that, from a rational stand-point, these doctrines are a tissue of lies and absurdities; but that fact need not prevent their general acceptance, especially by a sex constitutionally influenced by emotion rather than by judgment. It is also true that the feminist programme could never be carried out by society for any great length of time, since it implies a denial of the facts of nature and of the order of the universe; but that does not mean that it could not be adopted for a time long enough to destroy our Christian civilization, and perhaps to postpone for ages the descent of the New Jerusalem. There is in our doctrines the means of fighting this evil, and, with the Lord's help, of fighting it successfully. With so great, so vital a struggle in progress, how can we honorably avoid the call to arms?

It comes to us even from outside our ranks. Says Prof. Sedgwick, whom we have already quoted:

Meanwhile, where are the churches? Time was when they would have spoken with no uncertain sound, but today they stand dumb, if not too often deaf, before the rising tempest which threatens their destruction. The epoch calls for plain speech, for the taking of sides, for simple, old-fashioned morality, and for pure religion and undefiled. Those who are not with us in the battle for the conservation of womanhood, of home, of family, of morality and of decency, are against those things which make human life sweet and really worth living.

E. M. LAWRENCE GOULD.

DO WE NEED A NEW GOSPEL?

AN EXAMINATION OF CHURCHILL'S "INSIDE OF THE CUP."

A VERY significant characteristic of the fiction of our time is its attitude toward the Church and Religion. This attitude is two-fold. On the one hand, it is that of a conspiracy of silence. Stories of social life, among high and low, are written without a single allusion to the Church or Religion, either as making up any part of the routine of duty and of observance, or as entering at all into the life-motives of the actors. It is as if religion were no longer a vital factor in the life of our cities and villages; as if the observance of Sunday, the going to Church, and last of all the reading of the Bible, were customs of a past age or of a different race from ours. It surely is not without significance that modern life, even in cultured circles or what is called "our best society," can be depicted, by those calling themselves realists, in this manner.

On the other hand, there is what, from the religious point of view, we might regard as even worse than this attitude of silence and indifference. It is the attitude of avowed hostility, contemptuous criticism, even to ridicule. In the novel of society, if certain members of the week-end party attend church, they are regarded as eccentric or as having some weakness of body or mind; and the sermon is brought in at the dinner conversation to display the sharp wit of the various members of the party in assailing it or the preacher.

What is true of the popular fiction of the day is also true of the stage, where the church and religion, if introduced at all, are impersonated in the poor parson or the pretentious bishop, who can be made into an amusing feature of the comedy of the play. The novel of Mr. Churchill entitled "The Inside of the Cup" breaks over this barrier of silence, and brings the church and the vital function of religion

right up to the front rank of attention and interest. It is made something fundamental, on whose true or false conception society and the state must stand or fall. The preacher too here comes in by no means for ridicule, but is treated with a seriousness that is sad and even tragic; and no one can charge that this book represents either the indifferent silence or the avowed contempt and discordance of religion which the mass of the fiction of today seems to indicate.

It is the very fact of this seriousness of the book's tone and purpose which makes the novel a subject of interest to religious people, and warrants a careful examination by the church and its preachers. For the book, which starts out as a pleasant enterprise in social fiction, ends in a very ambitious effort toward not only moral but even theological reform. Beginning as a novel, it puts on in the end the garb of the apostle,—the evangelist of a new gospel and a new religion. Starting out as a picture of a traditional church with its dogmas and its rights, it ends in a complete overthrow of these, and the setting up of a new religion—the religion that discards tradition and its authority, the religion of the individual and his self-development and of the new “Gospel of democracy.”

The career of the hero of the novel is supposed to embody or symbolize the change that the Christian world and the present civilization are undergoing in throwing off the old and traditional authority and seeking to put on a new.

The rector of a quiet village church is called to the charge of a large and wealthy city parish. Believing, himself, devoutly in the church's holy foundation and mission, he finds himself, after this change, in nominal charge of an organization bearing a Christian name, but ruled over utterly by influences of the world, the flesh and the devil. In other words, while his large and fashionable church stands in the midst of a poor and wretched neighborhood, where poverty and vice stare in its face, yet these are ignored as having no human, spiritual relationship with it. When the rector would make a change, and engage the church in some efforts

of immediate, direct reform and relief of these surroundings, he is met with a timid reserve owing to the attitude of the parishioners toward the rich man who is the church's chief supporter, and whose authority and control must not be infringed upon by any rector of however lofty and merciful ideas. This rich monopolist of the church's influence is disturbed at the constant appeals for the poor and the down-trodden, and the urging of the duty of individual, personal sympathy and aid. At the same time he sees that the church must at least put on the appearance of mercy and charity, and whatever selfishness and greed it may countenance within, must at least wash the outside of the cup by some high pretenses and conspicuous acts of benevolence. With this in view the wealthy man undertakes, himself—although by measures of commercial meanness and dishonesty—to erect an imposing institution which shall emblazon his name and his church before the world; being careful, however, to retain the entire control of it in his own hands, to use as a powerful lever in shaping the opinions and the votes of the masses. Meanwhile, the rector in his visits among the poor, finds that the foul dwellings he has entered are owned by this same millionaire churchman, and that even the wages of vice are laid upon the church's altar to support the rector and the various conspicuous benevolences of the church. The revolt is so great that the rector, after long struggles with his sense of obligation to his vows and to the people, resigns his rectorship, and for a time renounces utterly his vocation as a minister. Finally, after having gone through a number of critical experiments, both theological and moral, in trying to find something to stand on and work from, he together with a little group of friends and sympathizers, undertakes the building up of a new Christianity and a new Church, with its authority not of Christ nor of a revealed Word but of the individual reason, and a new Gospel of brotherhood and democracy, as the basis of a new Protestantism,—the voice of the Protestant Cathedral!

Looked at from the literary point of view, as well as from

that of social economy and reform, there is absolutely nothing new in this somewhat exciting and drastic account of the selfishness of the rich man and the hypocrisy of the church-goers. The heartlessness of the wealthy worshippers, the warm Christmas-eve glow of the church's interior as contrasted with the chilly hearth and bare table of the dwellers in the slums,—all these have been told graphically and appealingly in books and in the magazines until they have become a commonplace, and are no longer available for the mere sensationalist. While doubtless easiest to write,—this kind of social stirring of the quagmires,—it is becoming more and more difficult to reach a conclusion, a satisfactory solution of the horrible problems raised, and especially so when the church's weakness is attacked, not merely on the moral or emotional side, but (what is a far more serious matter) on the rational or intellectual side. And it is this that Mr. Churchill attempts to do in the second, but in importance the primary, act of his story. Here the writer drops the narrative, and enters the theological chair; or from the slums he would construct a new pulpit. The long discourses of the reconverted rector, in company with his friends and in the pulpit, are the vehicle of the new theology, the new gospel, which Mr. Churchill does not hesitate to offer as supplying the defects and mending the weaknesses of the old. It is a bold venture; and if the author fails to realize the real audacity of such an effort, it is because he really does not see, and never has seen, the old in its real character and real value. The fact itself of the rector's weak abandonment of his charge and of his sacred commission as an ordained preacher of the Word, merely because a wealthy and overbearing parishioner was turning out to be a pharisee and a hypocrite,—this shows how thin is the estimate of his real responsibilities as a minister of the Church of Christ; and the ease with which he throws off all his early faith and even the moral restraints which had held him during his life thus far, so that he allows himself to be lured into a resort of vice—even though it be here that by a necessary dramatic requirement of the story he

meets the victim he is destined to save,—this all bears the air of an outside tinsel rather than of the true garment of the Christian ministry. Even in the rescued woman and in the group of benevolent souls who engage in the philanthropic movement to uplift the fallen, there is chiefly prominent the physical and the material protection and well-being, and very little evidence of any spiritual gospel or spiritual incentive new or old.

But if the past Christianity of the rector had been of so flimsy a character as to be blown over by this first gust of the world's lust and pride, what shall we say of the new Christianity or new religion which he would now substitute in its stead? We hardly dare call it a new Christianity, for Christianity surely means a doctrine and life based on the acceptance of Jesus Christ as a divine teacher,—that is, as one who "teaches with authority and not as the scribes." For surely here the Christ has to yield up his authority to that of this scribe or writer of "The Inside of the Cup." The authority, and therefore the religious force, of the teaching of Christ is taken away by the following elaborately and somewhat wearisomely reiterated arguments.

First and foremost and really all-embracing, is the denial of the Virgin Birth of our Lord, and therefore the making Him to be in origin and in teaching in nowise different from any illumined and spiritually gifted man. The Virgin Birth is denied emphatically and repeatedly, and without any attempt to enter into the deeper and more vital phases of the whole question of man's birth, the origin and source of the embryonic life, or the origin of distinct and higher species of the animal creation. The only basis of the denial, besides that of the author's own arbitrary assumption of its impossibility, is that of a fanciful interpretation of some of the Messianic prophecies regarding the Virgin, as that the term did not mean a maiden but a young woman, etc. But apart from this question of prophecy, we are distinctly told that to know Jesus "we must enter into His consciousness,"—that is, we must be as He was, enjoying whatever depth of Divine wisdom and of saving mercy He possessed who

came into the world to save His people from their sins, and for two thousand years has been looked up to by races of humanity struggling into civilization as the "Redeemer and Saviour of the World."

But even entering thus into the consciousness of Jesus we are not thereby led, as such an expression might have implied in the old traditional use, into a deeper, truer knowledge of that which we have held to be the Word of God—even that Word of essential Wisdom and Truth which became flesh in Jesus Christ Himself. We are told, indeed, in these Gospels, that our Lord did all His works of mercy among men that the "Scriptures might be fulfilled"; and that after His resurrection He opened the understanding of His disciples that they might understand these same Scriptures of the Old Testament, their "Moses and all the Prophets," and see in them the "things concerning Himself."

But any such Word of God known, according to the Gospels, to the "consciousness of Jesus" is, according to Mr. Churchill, repudiated by Jesus; and so all authoritative revelation in a Bible, either past or future. The author as much as asserts that Jesus did not Himself believe in the Old Testament as a whole; and that the very Gospels of our New Testament are a misconstruction of His teaching, and afford, therefore, an erroneous or corrupt basis of Christianity. To understand true Christianity, he says, we must become acquainted with the consciousness of Jesus; but as the only informants we have of this consciousness, namely, the Gospels of our New Testament, are discredited as giving us no true account of Him, therefore our only resource is to build up a new gospel of our own, and out of a Jesus of our own mind's conceiving.

"Personally," the writer says, "I believe our Lord merely used the Messianic literature as a convenient framework for His spiritual Kingdom of Heaven, and that the Gospels misinterpreted His meaning on this point,"—which must mean that whereas the Gospels interpreted the Messianic prophecies as foretelling a Divine Redeemer and Saviour,—

Virgin-born, and consequently the Emanuel, God with us,—Jesus Himself believed no such thing regarding Himself, and consequently the Christian Church is built upon a great delusion, a stupendous fraud! Not only is the Bible thus held up to be no authority for man's belief, but the chief destroyer of this Bible authority would be Jesus Himself!

With the testimony of the Gospels thus thrown aside as erroneous in the matter of the Old Testament, and nowise trustworthy in the description the Gospels give of Jesus and in their record of His sayings, the only Jesus that is left by this ardent reformer is such as any one man is as justified in portraying as another; and therefore the authoritative basis of religion is shifted from a Divine and an Incarnate Word to a creative human imagination and reason. In fact, Mr. Churchill says, "Religion is an undertaking—an attempt to find unity and harmony of the soul by adopting after mature thought a definite principle in life. If the principle worked, it was true."

Then religion is an experiment like any other, liable to failure, and especially liable to give way as "not working" whenever a strong temptation assails a man, opening to him for his selfish advancement, the way of least resistance to his instincts of self-love and of natural appetite. But it is doubtful if any religion, as a force in man's moral life, originated in any such questioning as to how it will work or whether it will pay. It must rather be the determining force of the "I ought" in a man's conscience that creates a force of will and of resistance, whether the thing contemplated will "pay" or not. "Lord, I believe," was the necessary assertion of the suppliant before he offered his prayer, "help Thou mine unbelief."

A fatal defect in the argument of those who deny the deity of Jesus while holding Him as the supreme human exemplar has been, that if the Gospel record is true, this Jesus must have been a conscious and deliberate deceiver, allowing and even requiring His disciples to believe Him to be Divine when He really knew He was not,—as when He is declared to have said to the Jews, "Before Abraham was I am," and

also when He said, "I and the Father are one; he that hath seen me hath seen the Father." Happily the present story escapes this dreadful situation, but only by declaring that the Gospels do not tell a true story of our Lord, and that hence Christianity, as we have known it, is only a fiction. "The gospels," says the rector, "were not written as history, but were composed to convert a simple, unlettered people to Christ." Moreover, "It was Paul and not the apostles to whom we owe the truth of the Resurrection." "It was not the vision but the impression, the *character*, that made the Resurrection true to him [Paul],"—which is to say, that while the vision was accepted as literally true with the ignorant, with the learned it was rather the intellectual "impression," the moral idea that served as the basis of the new movement.

As to what this Christianity is, thus based not upon the Gospel nor any final dogma or authoritative writing, we are told to conceive of it as a growth out of the subconscious divine element in the minds of individuals. "The supreme function of the Church," he says, "is to inspire the spirit of democracy." "I will arise," is the cry of the new humanity. "We come," he says, "through our selfish understanding, our Protestantism, to a glimpse of the true Protestantism, Democracy." How this democracy performs the functions of the Church, or of a saving instrumentality for men's souls, is not clearly pointed out. Is it by benevolent institutions, houses of mercy, the befriending of the fallen, the raising of wages and the reduction of poverty, the more even distribution of wealth, and the prevention of unjust monopolies? Shall these be preached from this Cathedral of democracy? But the writer seems to forget that the very villain of his story has practiced these benevolences in one way or another while being utterly vain and selfish at heart; so that the democracy of outward benefaction, the pleasing, the housing, the subsidizing of the poor, may be as truly, as the Church is accused of being, a cup which is outwardly clean, but filled with abominations within. For what is this democracy but the many composed of individuals; and what

is to govern these individuals, when only a subconscious divine is left? What is the restraining, the disciplinary power of such a religion as is thus described? "Grace, and being born again, is reaching down into the subconscious self in which we are divine potentially." Is not this saying that each man is a God to and for himself, and that the rule of democracy is a rule not of a great people subordinating themselves of their free will to a Supreme Divine Ruler and law, but the rule of arbitrary self-will, self-assertion, and self-authority?

It is difficult indeed to see, judging from the history of the past, how this taking away the ideal inspirations and the moral disciplines of the Church and religion is going to play the role of a redeemer to the human race, whose realm of the conscious with its passions and delusions of the hour, is not likely to recede before that of the subconscious, wherever this may be, in a people who know no God and no moral law, but that of mechanics or of nature. It is with the conscious, and *not* the subconscious, life of men that a vital religion must deal.

It would seem indeed as if Mr. Winston Churchill in the fervency of his endeavor to cleanse the cup, has succeeded finally only in breaking it to pieces, and then leaving us with no principle whatever for putting together the fragments. But happily to those who are in the light of the new dispensation dawning at this day on the Christian world from the opening of the interior spiritual meaning of the Holy Scriptures, it is plain enough that the cup thus broken to pieces is not at all the cup of Christianity. For, we may truly say, the author has not touched for a moment that true and holy cup—the Eternal Word of God, given in written revelation in a human language, and incarnate in human flesh in our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Happily, of such a Word the author seems to have not the most distant conceptions; happily he is free from the guilt of profanation; for, as we are taught, those only who have a sense of its *holiness* can profane *what is holy*.

It would be unjust to Mr. Churchill personally, to make

no mention of the high character he attaches to the Personality of Jesus, in his recent magazine article on "Our Need of a New Religion." In this he speaks of our Lord as the Supreme Personality in whom is most fully realized the divine Spirit and the divine Word. But the assertion is weakened by the reflection that the Word he refers to is not identical with those Scriptures which our Lord declared were all fulfilled in Him, but rather with the philosophical Logos, or Reason, of Philo Judæus and the New Platonists; and still further by the fact that with the record of the Gospels invalidated or treated as a human composition to instruct the ignorant, there is no authority for this conception of Jesus other than that of our own constructing out of unauthentic and more or less doubtful sources.

So while the cup of the writer's fiction lies strewn in pieces, that holy Cup remains and shall remain,—that cup of true doctrine from the Word of God to which our Saviour alluded when He spoke of the "cup of cold water given in the name of a disciple," that holy and blessed cup of salvation, the nourishing truth of the Redeemer of men, victorious over the cross and all temptation, which was named by our Lord when He said to His disciples, "this cup is the *new testament in my blood* which is shed for you. Drink ye all of it."

FRANK SEWALL.

THE WORD AS A WHOLE: V. THE REVELATION.

IN his preface to the "Apocalypse Revealed," Swedenborg says: "Many have toiled in the explanation of the Apocalypse, but as the spiritual sense of the Word has been hitherto unknown, they could not see the arcana which lie concealed in it, for these the spiritual sense alone discovers." Since these words were written very many more students have labored in the interpretation of the Apocalypse, yet without bringing its significance much more clearly before the view of the world. In keeping with the modern tendency, the prevailing effort has been to identify the facts set forth in the book with historical circumstances of Christian history, and to reject, as fanciful imagery without special significance, such parts as cannot be so linked with history. The same causes which almost resulted in the exclusion of the Revelation from the Biblical Canon, have succeeded in keeping the book from the practical use of every-day Christians. Few parts of it are commonly familiar to regular readers of the Bible. It has even been asserted that among New-Church people, where the Divine origin of the book and its verbal inspiration are fully acknowledged, there is little systematic study of its meaning and little general familiarity with its significance. A part of the reason is that both its natural and spiritual senses treat of conditions with which we are familiar only by study and instruction and not by experience. The book is fundamentally different from other parts of the Bible, and it describes literally circumstances and events which are on a different plane of experience.

Other parts of the Word of God generally treat in the literal sense of historical facts or practical conditions in the development of social life, and in the spiritual sense of the growth and unfolding of the soul-life of the race and of the

individual. Some parts picture decline, other parts spiritual advancement, but in every case change, movement and adjustment. But the Apocalypse in its literal sense we may almost say, has no distinct meaning, much of it being totally unintelligible to the natural mind; while in the spiritual sense it pictures a completion, a consummation, one great event in the spiritual world from which endless results are to follow, but which we ourselves can see only as reflected in earthly conditions. Other parts of Scripture are elements in a series relating to successive events in the Providence of God, but the Book of The Revelation is the end of the series, the climax, the close of a cycle. It is the crown of the Scriptures, just as the church which it proclaims is the crown of all the churches. It pictures the defeat of evil forces and the triumph of righteousness, the victory of spirit over flesh, the regeneration of the soul from the degradation of worldliness, the triumph of the Lord God in His Divine Humanity over all His enemies. It is a picture of final achievement. What follows can be but the peaceful fruits of victory. It is a book of promise and hope, a song of deliverance and a psalm of thanksgiving, because of spiritual prosperity.

The historical bearing of the book is thus summarized in the "Apocalypse Revealed":

After final judgment a new heaven of Christians was formed; but of those only who could receive the Lord as the God of heaven and earth, and who at the same time had repented in the world of their evil works. From this heaven, the New Church on earth, which is the New Jerusalem, is descending and will descend.

In another place in the same work it is said:

In the Apocalypse it does not treat of successive states of the Church, still less of the successive states of kingdoms, but from beginning to end it treats of the last state of the Church in heaven and on earth, then of the Last Judgment and of the New Church.

The preceding portions of the Word have pictured several church periods in the history of humanity, their rise and fall and their giving place to others in succession. The

Revelation identifies the last of such crises, the beginning of a period which shall endure forever. And it identifies this crisis from two points of view, the cause in the spiritual world, and the effect in the natural world—the readjustment of the heavens, and the consequent establishment on earth of a new basis for the kingdom of God, that is, the Church. There are two elements in the crisis relating to the other world which are parallel—parts of the final judgment by which evil conditions are subjected to order and righteousness is exalted, namely: the making of a new heaven and through it a new influx into the world. Two similar elements are involved in the earth-change, a consummation or closing of the First Christian Church and the beginning of a New Church which shall continue forever. Somewhat similar situations had arisen at the time described by the Flood, and at the time of the Lord's First Coming, but in each of these cases there was but a partial change; the new era then established was of necessity temporary. The change described in the Apocalypse is a permanent change. In the former instances the basis for what was new had necessarily been limited by the capacity of men on earth to respond. This last making of things new involved complete revelation, the giving to mankind of all that is needed to make the highest attainment of religion possible. Each of the former crises involved a new unveiling of the Divine, a new lesson to mankind of the nature and identity of the Lord, but always with some features kept back. This last dispensation involves a complete identification of Him and a minute unfolding of His Divine plans for human welfare. The significance of the events described spiritually in the Apocalypse lies in their finality. It is the last wondrous change of scene in the great drama of human life, the ultimate appearance of the Omnipotent, Divine Hero to reveal to an observing world His true character.

Manifestly then the relation of the Book of The Revelation to the spiritual sense of the whole Word is that of a final chapter in the story of life, a summary and gathering

together of all the threads that have been gradually introduced and interwoven in that Divine history of the race. All through the Scriptures there are hints concerning the great day of the Lord, prophetic suggestions of vast changes that were not entirely carried out in any former crises; and even after the Incarnation were promises given in the Gospels which had no fulfillment until the events took place which this final revelation, this crowning message of the Word, is given to describe. We know that the Sacred Scripture is a Divine description of the spiritual development of humanity, both in general of the race, and in particular of the individual who passes through similar periods of rise and fall, each time blessed with a greater portion of Divine intimacy. This last of the Sacred Books describes the final achievement, or the ultimate debasement, of the individual, according as his progress has been spiritually upward or downward. It describes the final blessing of those of the race who have been faithful to right ideals, and the spiritual degradation of those who have profaned holy things in thought and life. It is a period of judgment, when the evil are let into the fruitage of their own wrong doing and the good are privileged to enjoy some of the blessings warranted by their righteous endeavors and by their capacity to receive.

Preceding books of the Word have portrayed the workings upon human life of the two great evil forces, selfishness and worldliness, or by other names, evil love and false ambition. This Book pictures the overthrow of these as dominant powers by the inflowing life and power of the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. The Babylon of self-love and the dragon of false ambition are compelled to yield to Him "who was dead and is alive forevermore." Moses and the Prophets have shown how goodness and truth are continually subject to attack, and that temptation brings spiritual degradation whenever men turn away from God and become absorbed in the things of this world. Their victories and defeats in this life struggle form the substance of Scriptural narrative up to The Rev-

elation, where the judgment marks their ultimate success or failure according to their life's love. Law, Prophets, Psalms and Gospels have told of the successive unveilings of Divine truth for the instruction of men and angels; the Apocalypse tells of the final unfolding of the mysteries of true faith, the laws of Providence, the foundation truths, the opening of the eternal Word, so that the new generation may learn these heavenly secrets. Heretofore limited conceptions of charity have been taught to the world because men were not ready for the highest ideal; but in the new heaven and the new earth, true charity in heart and life is to be the very substance of religious success. Former dispensations presented such limited conceptions of marriage as mankind were willing to adopt, but in the new order, the Divine origin and significance of this holy relation is to be emphasized, for "the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready." The Revelation describes a time when the foundations are moved, when an old order is vastated and a new and everlasting order is inaugurated. The subject matter of other parts of the Word has been preparation; this final book presents the consummation, the fulfillment of all prophecy and preparation. And all this it does entirely in its spiritual sense. The literal statements were in a sense prophetic from man's standpoint, in time, but the spiritual description is from the point of view of the eternal present of God's sight.

Our truest grasp of the significance of the Apocalypse in relation to the other parts of Scripture is gained when application is made to the spiritual experience of the individual, the race in epitome, the Church in least form. We have been accustomed to identify certain divisions of Scripture with periods in natural life, as changes take place in the developing mind—infancy, childhood, adolescence and so on. May not the period of the Apocalypse be that of spiritual maturity, not necessarily a time of middle life or old age, but a time when true conceptions of God, of the neighbor, and of the meaning of life and duty, have become controlling factors. It is the beginning of regenera-

tion following the many changes of reformation, resolution and failure, and again success. It is a time when the Lord Jesus Christ is worshipped as God and Saviour, when His Word is accepted as the Divine guide of life, and when the heart is fixed in a love of living according to the Ten Commandments. It is not an intellectual condition of acceptance of newly revealed principles so much as a state of life, when wisdom comes to blossom, when youth begins to return, when the heart becomes softened to spiritual influences, and the mind awakened to keener interest in lessons of the spirit. It is then that faith alone is seen in its emptiness, that personal dominion, with its vaunted power, cloyes on the heart; then knowledge of the unseen is craved, and experience of the sweetness of heavenly peace is eagerly desired. This is the condition of one who is being regenerated. Of course there is the concomitant opposite condition of the one who is confirmed in evil and falsity, and his final self-destruction is pictured in this record of last stages, under the many strange symbols and circumstances that have made the book repulsive to some readers. Other parts of Scripture have referred to times in which evil and good, falsity and truth were becoming more and more intermingled, in this world and in the world of spirits; this book describes a time of separation, when each great motive of human life is freed from its arch enemy by the hand of the Lord, and given full dominance in the life of the individual. It involves such a fixed establishment of human freedom as the influences of evil can never again overcome. Individuals will of course fall short of the ideal as they have always done, but the opportunities for regeneration are greater than they have ever been before, and there is now to be eternal hope for men in the world to attain heavenly blessedness.

The relation of the Apocalypse to the other parts of the Word, is that of what is new to what is old. The lessons of the old have not been superseded but fulfilled in the newer application. Wise men will always bring forth from the Word "things new and old," but all of the old will be

understood in the light of the new. Accounts of Jehovah's care of the Children of Israel will always be read, but men of the new age will understand no other than the Lord Jesus Christ to be meant. The gospel accounts of the Son of God will lose no significance in the new recognition of the Divine Humanity of the Lord as the Saviour of mankind. The Ten Commandments will have added to their centuries of dominance a new significance by reason of their deeper application to every spiritual experience of the new Christian. Faith will have lost no importance but rather will have gained a new power when seen to be but the working form of charity. The Lord makes all things new by touching them with the renewing strength of His more intimate contact, and the result is a new age, a new dispensation and a new church.

But the spiritual relationship of the Apocalypse to other parts of the Word is not rightly seen without some realization of its reference to God Himself. The Books of the Law, as we have seen, present a narrative of the childhood and youth of the Lord Jesus Christ in the world; the Prophets and Psalms tell us of the temptations and spiritual victories over the powers of evil which He wrought; the Gospels narrate the process of glorification of the human nature through its successive stages; the Apocalypse tells us of the final triumph, the assumption of supreme power and glory by our all-loving Father and Saviour in His glorified Humanity. We are taught (*Apocalypse Revealed*, n. 957) that "there are two things in the prophetic book to which all things of it relate, first, no other God is to be acknowledged than the Lord, and second, no other faith is to be acknowledged than faith in the Lord." It tells us what our Lord has been doing since His ascension at Bethany, and what He is doing now. The book is what its name implies, a Revelation of Jesus Christ, and its foremost picture is of Him upon the throne, judging and governing all. It describes His glory and also the effect of His glory in the life of one who acknowledges Him and worships at His footstool. And it pictures a state of life on earth in

which men shall join the four and twenty elders in their cry to the Lord Jesus Christ upon the throne: "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power, for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." This last sacred book which God shall give to the world in His own language, heralds a change so far-reaching as to affect all creation; it proclaims a new allegiance to the one God that must unify and harmonize the universe. It announces such a consummation of the hopes of eternity as the Revelator thus describes: "Every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."

PAUL SPERRY.

"THE WORSHIP AND LOVE OF GOD."*

THIS "revised and completed translation," completed, that is to say, as far as it can be at present, since the end of Part III has never been found, opens once more the question of the status of this work in respect to Swedenborg's other writings, from which it differs much in style. By some, the "Worship and Love of God" has been considered to be a poetic fancy, written as a relaxation from profound philosophical studies, and not to be taken very seriously. No one with a spark of imagination could suppose that it was ever intended to be taken "seriously" in the sense of literally. There is a playfulness in the language, a constant use of metaphor, perpetually recurrent personifications of abstract principles, an obvious effort to make the dry abstractions of philosophy attractive by clothing them in artistic language and in a poetic form which seems almost ready to break into meter; and yet, with all this exuberance, the spirit of playfulness is not allowed to go too far, but is restrained by an essential reverence and sobriety, without which this sportive display of profound philosophy might easily be mistaken for the gamboling of an elephant, and take on a little of the ridiculous. But in spite of the playfulness, there is so much innocence and such childlike adoration of the Divine Goodness, that no such reproach attaches to the work.

* *The Worship and Love of God.* By EMANUEL SWEDENBORG. Originally published at London in 1745. In Three Parts. A Revised and Completed Translation, including the Third Part, now first published and translated into English from the Latin Manuscript of the Author, by Alfred H. Stroh, A.M., and Frank Sewall, A.M., D.D. Boston: Published by the Trustees of Lydia S. Rotch, Massachusetts New-Church Union. 1914. 292 pages, 12 mo. Cloth \$1.00.

"The Worship and Love of God" was written at the close of Swedenborg's career as a natural scientist, and before he entered on his work as a revelator of spiritual science. It thus stands as a connecting link, or intermediate, between the two phases of his philosophic labors. The poets have always seen farther than the rest of mankind into the mysteries of spiritual life; but while themselves possessing a certain open vision, they are usually lacking in critical faculty, and are unable to describe what they see sufficiently clearly for the message to be incapable of distortion or perversion. The poet's language is apt to be so enigmatical that his words convey various meanings to different readers; and the present essentially poetical work is not entirely free from the possibility of misapprehension on this score. This phase of Swedenborg's development is only a transient one. After all this preliminary preparation, he enters upon its final fulfillment in the unfolding of the drama of redemption and the arcana of heaven, and no faintest gleam of pleasantry, or of the fanciful remains; for he has entered into the Holy of Holies, and profound humiliation, earnestness and adoration are accompanied thenceforth by a deep wisdom which can scarcely be fathomed, and which seems to be inexhaustible. In reading the theological writings, we seem to hear the majestic tread of the armies of heaven marching on to the overthrow of age-long superstition and error, with trumpets sounding the attack.

To one trained in the critical methods of science, or accustomed to view truth in the light of a calm and unemotional philosophy, the flowery metaphors and the emulation of mythological personifications of scientific doctrines in the present work, may seem out of place. The writer of this review is free to confess that some of the more austere, critical footnotes which Swedenborg has lavishly appended to his treatise, are more attractive than the, to him, somewhat far-fetched imagery and allegory. But the man of science is not always successful in interesting the general public in his chosen topic. He meets a vast body of

people which will have none of his science, which in short votes pretty unanimously that he is dry, tedious and uninteresting. It is this great body of people that Swedenborg addresses in the present work. They cannot be interested by abstract truth, but must have the glamour of human life thrown over all of its details, and view it through the mists of a glowing rhetoric, before they can be induced to listen to the teacher. Swedenborg knows human nature, and abandoning the scientist's pride which is prone to say: You must listen to the lesson as I choose to teach it, or remain in ignorance, he adapts himself to the state of a wide circle of readers, approachable if themselves properly approached. To those who do not care to have their intellectual dish sugar-coated, we can say: Pass on to the more profound writings of our teacher; this book is not for you. Yet perhaps even such readers may be reconciled to a perusal of this work, if they view it not so much as a system of instruction, but rather as a gathering of brilliant suggestions in a veiled form, each a germ capable of growing in the mind of the reader into something new. If any one will read the admirable analytic index appended to this volume, he will find that almost every entry is as if it were designed to awaken curiosity. Even if the ideas were not new (and probably they will be new to most people), the novelty of their presentation is such as to arouse attention. In one word, the book is an *allegory*, and as such it shares with all works of that type from John Bunyan down, in that valuable asset, a perennial interest. Each generation puts its own thought into the allegorical model, and such a work is continually reborn, where a more precise statement, true in its day, is soon dead and laid on the shelf as having only historic interest. We may venture to predict that Swedenborg's "Worship and Love of God" will have many rebirths. Its rich imagery is capable of receiving new meanings as our own insight into the human and the natural universes progresses. Its childlike simplicity is united to a veiled profundity, while for absolute originality there are few works with which it can be compared. In a way, the

"Worship and Love of God" is a continuation of the "Principia," but with a difference. The "Principia" treats of atmospheres, and physical forces, and the creation of worlds. The "Worship and Love of God" in addition sums up the results of the author's intervening anatomical studies of body, sense and brain, and rises into a new creation—that of a spiritual being in its seven successive stages.

The work opens with a recognition of the necessity and the universality of orderly change and progression. There are, it is true, some failures to hit upon the precise nature of this progress. In the opening pages, which form a summary and an extension of the author's cosmological theories, already published in the "Principia," we read:

That the form resulting from the connecting series of all the starry universes, is the exemplar and idea of all forms, may appear not only from this, that it serves as the firmament of the whole heaven, but also from this, that the first substances of the world, and the powers of its nature, gave birth to those universes, from which, and their coöperation, nothing but what is most perfect flows forth; this is confirmed also by the distances of the stars from each other, preserved for so many ages, without the least change intervening. Such forms protect themselves by their own proper virtue, for they breathe something perpetual and infinite. (n. 6 b.)

We know today that the stars are not fixed, but are moving rapidly and changing, though very slowly. We conceive now that the variety in spectral types and in the acquired velocities of true proper motion, is connected with the ages of the stars and a progression in their development. Perpetual fixity would not be conducive to perfection. In fact, this lapse from complete truth has come because Swedenborg did not adhere fully to his own principle of the universality of change with which he starts out. The essential idea is true, and only needs to be emended and completed with improved data to be reborn, as was said above.

In the sections concerning Paradise and its living creatures, Swedenborg has apparently borrowed from Lucretius

the idea that animals were born from buds which grew on specially prepared plants, and that plants had previously been formed from minerals through the action of the sun's rays: "The varieties of efflorescent beauty were in proportion to the number of the clods of earth on which the different rays of the sun exerted their influence" (n. 19). But though in appearance we have here a doctrine of evolution, born before its time, or before the world of scientific knowledge had been furnished with facts out of which such a theory could be successfully formulated, I shall show reason to doubt whether this is the true meaning of these enigmatical passages.

The "Autocrat of the Breakfast Table," in one of his morning walks with the school teacher, talks about the Professor's house; and presently we find that the house has not a little symbolic meaning, and that it prefigures the house of the mind. But "did I talk all this off to the school mistress? Why, no—of course not. I have been talking with you, the reader, for the last ten minutes." And when pressed to tell what he actually said to the pretty school teacher, instead of this philosophical dissertation, the Autocrat declines to say, but opines that "in the classic version of a familiar phrase used by our Master Benjamin Franklin, it is *nullum tui negotii*." To apply Dr. Holmes' skit to the present case, if any one supposes that the first pair on their wedding morn talked all that learned philosophy in Part III, or that Swedenborg ever intended this as a verbatim report of the conversation, he must have a very large credulity, and but little knowledge of lovers' ways. It may not be possible to surmise just what Swedenborg intended to deduce from this concluding section when completed, but it seems to the writer that this is a veiled discourse on the development of the higher degrees of the soul of man through the union of love and wisdom in the life. That the account of the birth of the first-born in Chapter 2 of Part I was not intended as an authoritative revelation of the origin of the human race may be seen by Swedenborg's own estimate of this work in his "History of Creation as

Given by Moses" (Reviewed in the NEW-CHURCH REVIEW, vol. xix, p. 250, April, 1912), where he says: "Let the reader believe as he chooses," thus definitely stating that this part of his thesis is purely speculative. It is quite evident that the practical difficulties attending the nurture of a helpless human infant without the aid of parents clad in physical forms, and necessarily of animal rank, did not enter into Swedenborg's speculation, if, indeed, this concerned the subject of natural births; but is it not possible, nay more, is it not probable, that these sections in reality treat not at all of the modes by which natural forms of life were evolved, but of the spiritual creation of man, described in the interior sense of the first two chapters of Genesis, and here developed especially with relation to the mental life of the race? The wonderful tree in the midst of the garden is none other than the tree of lives of Genesis, which never grew in any natural soil, but is wholly symbolic. "As the days of a tree are the days of my people" (Isaiah, lxv, 22). Into this wonderful tree were gathered all of the choicest juices of earth in order that the soul, burning with the desire to "bring into effect and thus turn into continual uses, the good pleasure and decrees of the Supreme Mind," might be furnished with all things necessary to its development.

The tree of life itself unfolded its branches, which bore this golden and vital fruit, into a soft and easy womb, and covering it with a thin bark and soft leaves drew off the nourishing juice from the neighboring leaves, and was solicitous for its life only. The neighboring trees also contributed their juice, by instilling it into the roots of this tree which crowned the center of the grove, rejoicing that they were allowed to impart from their juice something of life to the same. (n. 36.)

Is this to be taken literally? Is it not evident that we have here a symbolic picture of the preparation through all the ages for the life of the coming race? The race grows, like the individual, by processes which are vital, and have to be described in terms similar to those which relate to the growth of a tree. Paleontology

has its phylogenic tree. In case some wholly new and revolutionary development of mankind is to be depicted, then this is as if an egg were produced by the accumulation of preceding vital forces, growing until at last it bursts, and a wholly new manner of life appears. Each step in the life of society grows out of preceding stages. Streams of knowledge from the remote past, the juices of other "trees," or the experiences of other civilizations, are gathered into our own and help to nourish it.

Nor was nature alone at hand to guard with all her aids, but Heaven also lent favor by its presence; for its inhabitants, or spiritual minds, were let down for this gracious purpose, that they might second and direct the offices of nature; also that they might guard, lest anything infest this sacred grove; for, the instant any fierce animals overleaped the boundary prescribed by the intelligences, being struck with sudden terror, they fled far away into their forests, or with a faltering step fell down on their knees as if to worship their Prince and Lord. (n. 37.)

Unknown to us, the angelic heavens watch over the development of the race. The keys of human history are to be found in the watchful care of a Divine Providence which, by the ministration of angels, quickens the springs of action in the minds of men. The forces of evil which threaten the dissolution of society, are in some mysterious way withheld before they have accomplished their end. We do not see how the thing is done, but before we realize it, a sudden wave of public opinion sweeps over a nation, indeed, over the whole world, and new activities are set in motion, restraining evil, inaugurating new efforts for good. If our eyes were only opened to see these heavenly aids, we need fear no foe, for "they that be with us are more than they that be with them," as Elisha showed to his servant (II Kings, vi, 16). Victor Hugo, in his powerful picture of Waterloo, describing the overthrow of the man who thought that Providence was on the side of the heaviest battalions, rises to the sublime where he says: "Was it possible that Napoleon should have won that battle? We answer, No. Why? Because of Wellington? Because of Blücher? No. Because of God."

The subjects described in these pages from which we have been quoting were, indeed, developed according to the "thread of reason," and before the author had been shown the interior meaning of the first chapters of Genesis; but subsequently, in his "History of Creation," he expresses his amazement on finding that the explanation which had been reasoned out from a knowledge of the mental faculties of man and the probable order of their development, agrees with that which he subsequently learns is already described in the spiritual sense of the Word. This sense, as we know, does not concern the natural creation, but relates to the regeneration, or birth of the soul, and toward this goal our author was being led in the work before us.

If there is reason to believe that Parts II and III are allegory, what shall we say of Part I, which begins with what seems to be a summary of the cosmological teachings of the "Principia"? To this question I would reply that, while there is much that consists in a simple statement of facts or theories of natural science, yet even here there is a difference, and a blending of fact and fancy which is suggestive of a different purpose from that of merely conveying scientific truth. The sun before entering upon its parturient stage is likened to a great *cosmic egg*. It is surrounded by an opaque medium which is compared to the albumen of the egg, and which, like the white of an egg, is pabulum to nourish the growth of the planetary bodies. The central fires of the sun are compared to the yolk of the egg. In the fullness of time, the vitalizing fires break forth, the opaque mantle is parted into as many sections as there are to be planets, and each section rolls itself into a sphere. Swedenborg points to the novae which break forth from time to time in the starry heavens as instances of the birth throes of incipient solar systems. There is much to be said in favor of the conception, although perhaps it is doubtful whether all of the planets were produced at one birth. There may have been as many recurrent processes as there are planets.

If Part I, no matter if it be a description of cosmical

processes, is in addition an allegorical picture of the development of the sense life of man, there is a reason for the choice of images. Man is a microcosm, or little universe. His corporeal existence begins with a little sphere, whose segmentation into eight derived cells might be remotely connected with the derivation of eight principal planets from the sun. But the analogy must not be too closely pressed. The segmentation of the mother cell into equable daughter cells has no precise counterpart in planetary evolution. There are more than eight planets and they are quite unequal, while the duplication of cells by division does not end here. Nevertheless, after making every allowance for the inevitable distinction between physiological and cosmological development, there is an analogy between the two which can be carried on into further processes. Physiologists are accustomed to liken the involuntary activities of those organs of the body which supply its nourishment to *vegetative* functions, while those muscles and sense organs which take part in conscious movements are like the animal creation. The cosmological images of Part I are again invoked in Part II, where, as in n. 41, the brain is compared to a starry heaven of concentrated type, or to "the grand egg of the world portrayed in a kind of effigy;" and since the symbolic connection between the two orders of phenomena is here explicitly named, there is reason to believe that it has been maintained from the beginning of the thesis.

The mere suggestion of these physiological analogies ought to be sufficient to show that under the guise of a description of the development of the earth with verdure clad, Swedenborg is really describing the organs of the human body and their orderly evolution, beginning with an embryonic stage in which, though on a minute scale spatially, there is concealed the potency of all succeeding changes. With this conception in mind, notice the language in the following passage:

Innumerable streams, bursting from their fountains dissected this garden, and, preparing a way for themselves through beds of

violets and evergreens, sported in perpetual circuits, whose rivulets, cut into multifarious hidden channels like so many blood-vessels full of warm blood, watered the members of their earth and by winding ways returned to the gentle heads of their fountains as to their hearts. Thus the earth itself, a large body, as it were, not unlike its flowering and fruit-bearing offspring, was luxuriant with its veins, and thus continually nourished the roots of its germinations with a milky moisture pregnant with principles and little eggs. This was the first scene of the theater of this world, and such were the painted tapestries with which it was adorned. (n. 21.)

To the anatomist, the wonderful intricacies of the interiors of the body are as beautiful as gardens of flowers. He sees poetry and flowers where the ignorant see nothing but gore. Note the enthusiasm of Bell in his treatise on the hand, or read that exhilarating production, "The Human Body and Its Connection with Man" by Dr. J. J. G. Wilkinson, and you will recognize that Swedenborg belongs to the fraternity of the anatomists, and in his ecstasy he is painting anew the Soul's Kingdom—the kingdom of the body.

There are passages scattered through this work, chiefly as footnotes, which, even if all the rest were put aside, would constitute an instructive Primer of Philosophy. It might contain such notable doctrines, for the most part entirely original with Swedenborg, as these:

The doctrine of forms (n. 6 *b*).

The presence of the sun in his universe by his rays, and the function of the sun to cherish, adorn, nourish, preserve, preside over motions, and enlighten the orbs of his kingdom (n. 7 *c*).

The origin of plants from plastic force (to be likened to a soul) excited from conjunction of active forms (ether) with the earth's forces of inertia through the mediation of the rays of the sun (n. 20 *m*).

Cyclic processes in the creation of plants and animals, the most perfect, conceived from the supreme aura, appearing last (n. 22 *o*).

The origin of animal forms from an essence which is

spiritual or living, infused into the form or active powers of nature through the medium of the radiation of the Sun of Life (n. 25 *r*).

Divine Providence is universal law from the complex of particulars (n. 26 *s*).

An image of creation in human minds (n. 28 *t*).

Of the human soul (n. 33 *x*).

The form of the body from the soul by means of fibers (n. 44 *d*).

The use of the atmospheres of the natural world to sustain the orders and states of the body (n. 50 *i*).

Thought is a certain kind of discourse with a man's self. In place of the air, whence sound from the mouth is derived, in the mind is the most pure air which is called ether, and which agrees in all its nature with air, but is more perfect (n. 53 *p*).

Essential principles, as seeds, unfold themselves to ultimates, and return to inmosts in cyclic order (n. 55 *r*).

The things of heaven appear on earth, but as in a shade through correspondence (n. 55 *s*).

Organs and viscera have the power of acting, but not from themselves, for they must either admit, or invite, their force from outside themselves (n. 58 *y*).

The source of the ether is the sun itself, emanating in smallest or purest forms which receive discretely the activities or active forces of the sun (n. 62 *b*).

Sensation was originally by interior ideas falling by a superior way into sense; but now the sense of heavenly goodnesses is slowly and tardily recovered from external sense images (n. 63 *d*).

How images from natural light can serve as means for the production of ideas (n. 64 *f*).

The origin of folly and hatred is shown by a transcription, as follows:

The sun is the fountain of all light and heat in his world, nor is he the cause of shade and cold; but shade is the privation of his light, and cold is the privation of his heat; the sun is never deprived of light and heat, but earthly objects, in consequence of

not being capable of being penetrated by his light and heat; then also the directions of his rays produce this effect, whence come darkness and cold. This sentence, by a change in the form of expression, reads thus in a spiritual sense: God is the Fountain of all Intelligence and Love in His own heaven, nor is He the cause of folly and enmity, but folly is the privation of His Intelligence, and enmity is the privation of His Love; God is never deprived of Intelligence and Love, but human minds, which do not suffer themselves to be ruled by the light of His Intelligence, and by the rays of His Love, also the determination of His rays, that is of truths and goodnesses, produce this effect, whence come all folly and hatred. (n. 65 g.)

Thought begins in the cortical glands of the brain, which are composed of the purest fibers, resembling those of the body, but impenetrable by its fluids. In place of them, they admit a certain one in which is life (n. 68 m).

There are many other footnotes, some of them equally important.

The wholly rational and philosophic form of these footnotes, which constitute a running commentary on the text, precludes the supposition that the personifications in the body of the work were meant for anything else than fables, or that the poetic fancy of the birth of man from a plant was intended to teach any other lesson than that the highest states of human life are attained through perception of heavenly good, and the next highest through the knowledges of truth, thought being a lower order of life from which action, its highest order, proceeds. Since Swedenborg at the time this book was written was beginning to learn that the ancients had symbolical writings in which spiritual instruction was concealed under natural images, what could be more likely than that he should try his hand at such composition himself?

It has been suggested that this work contains foreglimpses of the doctrine of evolution as held by present-day science (See the "Observations" of Rev. Frank Sewall, on page 288 of this edition). We can hardly admit this in any exact or far-reaching sense; but perhaps there are in this little treatise some philosophic concepts which are of

more fundamental importance than even the doctrine of evolution; because, if we find that a more complete and perfect evolution naturally follows as a corollary from the doctrines of influx, forms and uses, the latter may be said to contain the former by implication, only awaiting the rich confirmation from accumulated experience.

Swedenborg's doctrine of *uses*,—namely, that the law of use is the highest law in creation, or that what can be of use is preserved, but what is not useful is rejected,—contains the keynote of evolution. It was adumbrated by Empedocles, who taught that the rejection of the imperfect is a necessary step in the production of the perfect. The conception has been minted into current speech in Herbert Spencer's happy phrase, "the survival of the fittest." It forms the basis of the doctrine of "natural selection" of Charles Darwin, who, however, saw but one face of the problem.

Swedenborg's doctrine of *forms* embraces as a subordinate feature that correlation of organisms which many naturalists have recognized, but whose importance Darwin and Wallace were the first to fully grasp. This doctrine of forms, however, goes really much farther than that of present-day naturalists, for it correlates not only the components of the natural kingdoms with each other, but each kingdom with all the rest in a universal grasp which finally leads up to an all-embracing kingdom of spirit which includes nature. The teachings of Lamarck and of his neo-Lamarckian disciples—Cope, Packard, Francis Darwin, and others,—with those of DeVries in his "mutation" theory, and many others, will be needed to supplement Darwin's "natural selection," before the power of Swedenborg's doctrines of influx, discrete degrees, and successive orders of forms will be realized in biology; while we are only just beginning to apprehend his far-reaching cosmogony.

Swedenborg alone gives the full formula of evolution: spiritual influx embodied in ultimates through the performing of uses. To perfect the partial conception, a further addition was necessary—a principle of selection of rival

modifications through adaptation to the performance of uses, the most perfectly adapted being chosen; but before there can be opportunity for choice, there must be impetus to the production of innumerable varieties from the Divine Infinitude, and this is creative influx. Neither a haphazard chance, nor an arbitrary compulsion, could fulfill the necessity of the complete correlation which is implied by Swedenborg's doctrine of the fifth natural form "by which one thing regards another as well as itself, nor is there anything but what consults the general strength and concord" (n. 6 b^s; compare illustrations in my review of "The History of Creation," this REVIEW, vol. xix, p. 256). Energy is the perpetual inflowing of a divine-proceeding from the Inmost Divine through the spiritual world into the natural universe. Neither man, nor any of nature's activities can destroy the least portion of this infinite energy. It is that beyond space which causes space to be, and fills it with forms of motion in which energy is received; but the energy itself is purely spiritual.

While these principles are more fully developed in the author's later writings on the "Intercourse between the Soul and Body," and "Divine Love and Wisdom," their essentials had already been apprehended and were pretty definitely stated in the work before us, as the following quotations show:

There are two principles perfectly distinct from each other, one natural, in itself dead, the other spiritual, in itself living; this latter acts efficiently, ruling most singly in everything, and universally in all, in order that nature may breathe and intend nothing but uses. (n. 24.)

It is now clear, that nature durst not at all, without command or summons, introduce herself into the chambers of our life, but that the Supreme and His Love, according to the intuition of ends, that is, according to His own decision, adopted nature, and adapted her forms altogether to those uses which He intended. This therefore is the order from which all our laws and decrees of nature flow, and from which comes our fate; all these things are derivative veins from that one single Fountain. Supreme things therefore, or things superior in order, inflow into inferior things, and these into ultimate things, but not *vice versa*. (n. 66'.)

The allegorical parts of the present treatise would suffer if severed from their connection, and extensive quotations cannot be attempted here. The cantos in Edmund Spenser's "Faery Queen," which describe the house of Psyche, have in them much that is true and beautiful, but show no such wonderful insight into the nature of man as that contained in n. 47 of this work; and the paradisiacal sports of the celestial intelligences in n. 42 are evidently intended to represent that highest form in nature, mentioned above, by means of which each created thing is reciprocally united with the universal complex. Modern science, which would have to reject the literalist's rendering of these stories, could easily be reconciled to them as modes of expressing profound philosophic doctrines in the garb of fable. Some of the brightest minds of literature and science have not hesitated to adopt the fable as a means of conveying instruction, and usually without any danger of being misunderstood. In the present instance the fable is not pure, but a certain amount of fact is mixed with the fancy, which to some may suggest doubts as to the meaning intended; but even so, we think that the case for the symbolic interpretation of considerable portions of this work is overwhelming.

FRANK W. VERY.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

CHRISTIAN UNITY.

NOTHING perhaps indicates the progress of the Second Coming of the Lord so well as the attitude of the denominations towards Christian Unity. For we are taught that in the beginning all the members of the Apostolic Church loved one another as brethren; but that this brotherly love gradually faded away during the first three centuries, and evils crept in, and with them came falsities and dissensions which rent the Church into parties, and sects, and at length into denominations at enmity with one another. So the Church of the Lord's First Coming was destroyed. The destruction of charity manifested in these enmities and estrangements, and the perversion of true doctrines by these falsities, arising out of the evils of selfishness and pride of opinion, and the thirst of ruling over the souls of men, brought the end, and made the Second Coming of the Lord and the institution of a new Christian Church—Christian in spirit, in life, in doctrine, and in faith in the Lord—necessary for the salvation of the world.

This Second Coming is in the clouds of the letter of the Divine Word which had been thus falsified. It reveals the true nature of the God of infinite love and wisdom, incarnate in a human life taken to Himself by birth from a Virgin,—in a human life glorified and made Divine-Human and perfectly one with Himself, to be the abode with men of the one true God of heaven and earth.

This revelation of God Himself within His Word brings His Church to judgment, for it shows how it has lost its life of charity and faith with Him and from Him, and its unity in Him and His service. It rebukes and checks this disintegrat-

ing work of selfishness, and begins to "make all things new" by drawing attention to the Scripture texts which must be practised by all who will be of His New Christian Church, saying: "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this will all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another" (John xiii, 34, 35); and praying: "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me" (John xvii, 21).

In June, 1866, the Rev. Augustus Clissold, then Chairman of the Swedenborg Society of London, in an address at its fifty-sixth anniversary, called attention to evidences of the awakening of this spirit of unity in the Christian denominations of that day. He said:

You are all aware of the importance assigned by Swedenborg to the year 1757, as the commencement of a great change in the spiritual world, or world of causes, and of a corresponding change in the natural world, or world of effects. This change was the commencement of the reduction of all things to Divine order in both worlds, with a view to the re-union of the Church upon earth with the Church in heaven, and thus to the restoration of unity. It is remarkable that a great desire for unity in Christendom has recently sprung up in various quarters in a very extraordinary manner.

He then goes on to give examples of this awakening of the desire for Christian unity. In 1853 the Eastern Christian Society was formed at Rome, under the sanction of the Pope, for the purpose of first uniting the Eastern and Western Churches, and of then bringing the Protestant bodies into fellowship with this re-united Catholic Church. But war with Russia interfered with the undertaking. In 1857 an Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom was formed in London, composed of Roman Catholics, Greeks, and Anglicans. There were then seven thousand members who engaged in the work with the promise to offer up daily a given form of prayer for the peace and unity of the Church, and, what was remarkable, the prayer was addressed to the Lord Jesus Christ. Considerable literature was published to

promote the cause, an extract from which was made by Mr. Clissold to show its character, as follows:

No! my brethren, the deepest thinkers of the day are stretching forth to a unity which shall comprehend all these scattered members. They feel that if the sixteenth century was one of dispersion, the nineteenth and twentieth must be ones of re-union, if the Son of Man, when He cometh, is to find *the* faith (as the original Greek is most correctly rendered) on the earth.

Notice that the sixteenth century, when the first Christian Church was approaching its end, is recognized as the period of dispersion into sects of disintegration. Mr. Clissold devoted a large part of the remainder of his address to showing that this reactionary movement had reached the right principle of unity to guide its endeavors, for he quotes from Archbishop Manning and others prominent in it, as saying,

The chief end of the Church is the restoration to the world of a true knowledge of God; . . . the unity of Christians has, as its pattern or archetype, the oneness of nature which is between the Son and the Father; . . . the unity of the Godhead is both the archetype and cause of the unity of the Church.

No consistent theory has ever been ventured on to explain the unity of the faith on any principle which will not ultimately refer it to the unity of the Divine Mind.

The fact of the Church being now visibly disunited is an infallible proof that she has fallen away somehow or other from the true and only center of unity. (Unity of the Church, pp. 176, 226, 218.)

This center from which the Church had fallen away is further shown to be the unity of God—the unity of the Father and the Son in the Divine-Human life of our Lord Jesus Christ. Archbishop Whately is quoted to show it as follows:

No point in these systems of speculative theology has so much exercised the perverted power of divines of this stamp as the mystery of the Trinity; or, as they might with more propriety have called it, the mystery of the Divine Unity: for though in itself the doctrine, so sedulously inculcated throughout the Scriptures, that there is but one God, seems to present no revolting difficulty; yet, on rising from the disquisitions of many scholastic divines on the inherent distinctions of the three Divine Persons, a candid reader cannot but feel that they have made the Unity of God the great and difficult mystery; and have, in fact, so nearly explained it away, and so bewildered the

minds of their disciples, as to drive them to withdraw their thoughts habitually and deliberately from everything connected with the subject, as the only mode left for the unlearned to keep clear of error. (*Errors of Romanism*, p. 84.)

Thus the conclusion is reached that the unity of the Church has been destroyed by its destruction of the Unity of God in its doctrines and life, which have divided the Godhead into three distinct persons instead of attributes of Divine Love, Divine Wisdom, and Divine Power, dwelling in fulness in the Lord Jesus Christ bodily, and so made manifest to us. It is the resulting loss of relation to the Lord Jesus Christ as the personal presence of God with men that has let charity, brotherly love, and practical faith and obedience die out of the Christian Church. It is the restoration of this relation to Him in His Second Coming, in power and great glory in the clouds of the letter of His Holy Word now being laid open to the light of heaven, that is to bring the fulfilment of His final prayer for His Church, saying, "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

The Rev. William B. Hayden attributed to this influence of the Lord in His Second Coming the "Congress of Churches" which met in Hartford, Connecticut, in 1885, and in Cleveland, Ohio, in the following year (*Essays and Discourses*, p. 31). In connection with this movement in Connecticut the "Federation of Churches," which has now assumed national proportions, had its origin. In these early meetings clergymen and laymen of all denominations assembled to discover if possible some common grounds of agreement and coöperation. The discussions were open, free, and generous; and at least developed feelings of rational toleration and brotherly love and sympathy. They attracted wide attention and made a deep impression upon the religious world. New-Churchmen took a lively interest in them and served among the officers and on the board of management. The essayist (Mr. Hayden) prophesies that the platform for the final unification of Christendom, which was then sought

after, will be found in the three essentials of the New Church, which he states as follows:

1. The supreme and sole Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ: our Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier.

2. An acknowledgment of His Holy Word as the fountain of eternal truth, capable of giving instruction to angels and to men.

3. Obedience: a life according to the Divine Commandments the only means (on man's part) of eternal salvation.

But Mr. J. Howard Spalding, in the *Re-Union Magazine* of London for June, 1910, returns to Mr. Clissold's view that the Unity of God in Jesus Christ will afford an adequate platform; he writes:

But though Christian union is not necessarily destroyed by theological disagreements, it would be greatly furthered if certain fundamental truths of the Word were universally and unequivocally received. If, for instance, the absolute unity of God, and the truth that He can only be thought of and therefore approached through the glorified humanity in which He has revealed Himself, were firmly believed as the very cornerstone of Christian doctrine, most of the errors which have devastated the Church would fall away and disappear. It would then be seen that the Incarnation of the one God in human mind and flesh was the supreme Divine effort to accomplish the end for which man was created; and that it was the work of love and judgment by which a new and living way was opened for mankind to Himself; so that man might be able to acquire, if he would, not a righteousness of his own, but a real "Righteousness of God, by faith," possessed by him, not as his own, but as the Lord's in him. (Reprinted in the *New-Church Review*, Vol. XIX, pp. 196, 197.)

But Swedenborg seems to go even farther, and to make the platform for unity so broad that it may embrace all the religions of the world, when he puts charity, or love for the Lord and the neighbor, first, and makes faith, or doctrines, entirely subordinate and subservient; for we read:

What pertains to doctrine does not itself make the external, still less the internal [of the Church]; nor does it distinguish the churches before the Lord; but it is a life according to the doctrinals that does this; all of which, provided they are true, look to charity as their fundamental. What is a doctrinal but that which is to teach how a man must live? In the Christian world the doctrinals are

what distinguish the churches; and from them men call themselves Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists, or the Reformed and the Evangelical, and by other names also. It is from what is doctrinal alone that they are so called; which would not be at all, if they would make love to the Lord and charity towards the neighbor the principal things of faith. The doctrinals would then be only varieties of opinion respecting the mysteries of faith, which truly Christian men would leave to every one according to his conscience, and would say in their heart that one is truly a Christian when he lives as a Christian, or as the Lord teaches. Thus from all the differing churches there would become one Church; and all the dissensions which exist from doctrine alone would vanish; yea, the hatreds against one another would be dissipated in a moment, and the Lord's kingdom would come upon earth. (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 1799.)

Now, while this may not come in a moment, it certainly is the Divine ideal taught in the Gospels, and it may be depended upon as an adequate platform for the realization of Christian unity in the future, and perhaps in a future not so very far removed.

It was doubtless in accordance with this ideal, and with a desire to do all in his power as a New-Churchman to promote the realization of it, that Hon. Charles C. Bonney proposed and brought about the World's Parliament of Religions in connection with the Columbian Exposition at Chicago in 1893. In that experience were found valuable lessons of how New-Churchmen may coöperate in movements for *religious* unity, broader in its scope, and mightier in its significance, than all movements for merely Christian unity; and not less easily recognizable as a result of the descent of the New Jerusalem from God out of heaven in His Second Coming. We cannot doubt that this great event made a deep impression upon the Christian, as well as upon the gentile, world leading toward unity, when the Roman Catholic Bishop Keane, of Washington, D. C., exclaimed, "Sweet indeed has it been for God's long separated children to meet at last, sweet to see and feel that it has been an awful wrong for religion, which is of the Lord of love, to inspire hatred, which is of the evil one; sweet to tie again the bonds of affection broken since the days of Babel, and to taste 'How good and how sweet a thing it is for brethren to live in unity.'"

Did it not make visible, for all who had eyes to see, the great catholic teaching of the New Church, that "there is a conjunction of heaven by means of the Word with those who are outside of the Church, where there is no Word; for the Lord's Church is universal, and is with all who acknowledge the Divine and live in charity." "The universal Church on the earth in the sight of the Lord resembles a single man, just as heaven does; but the Church where the Word is and where the Lord is known by means of it is like the heart and lungs in that man" (Heaven and Hell, n. 308). Did not the Lord say, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd" (John x, 16)?

It has been the spirit of this, together with the direct command of the Lord to His disciples to "Go forth into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," that has constrained the Church to endeavor to perform the external functions of the heart and the lungs to the Church universal by sharing with all nations and people the knowledge of the Lord in His Word. A remarkable evidence of the Divine approval of this effort is given in the successful distribution of the Scriptures, translated into so many languages and tongues, widely over the face of the earth. But here it is—in this effort to evangelize the world—that the Church has been called to account most sharply for being rent into so many sects and denominations, instead of dwelling together in the unity of the Lord. How could Christianity, thus divided and torn, present the Gospel of love and unity to the world!

Handicapped, baffled, aye, impressed with the sinfulness of all this, the Church assembled in the Ecumenical Missionary Conference in New York, in 1900. And impressed with the importance of it, the Lambeth Conference of the Anglican Churches of the world promulgated a basis for Christian unity in 1888, to which important modifications were made at its session of 1908. Then followed the great World's Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in June, 1910, brought about by Dr. J. R. Mott, the leader of the Students' Volun-

teer Missionary Union. Eight Commissions had been appointed two years in advance to gather information on the various aspects of missionary work throughout the world, and report at this Conference. Twelve hundred delegates, representing nearly every type of Protestant faith, were present to hear these reports and discuss them. The most important report, awakening the greatest interest and providing the culminating work of the Conference, was that on "Coöperation and the Promotion of Unity."

But here especially a limitation, which the Conference had imposed upon itself, was most seriously felt as a hindrance, namely, the understanding that all matters in which there might be differences of religious belief should be avoided in the interest of good-fellowship. Again and again the speakers found themselves approaching the danger line, when the greatest excitement would sweep through the assembly—everybody seemed to wish to go on, but nobody dared, or felt that he had a right, to do so. And the Conference adjourned with a feeling of eagerness for another ecumenical gathering in which no such limitations should exist. The challenge is said to have been then given to the Protestant Episcopal Church to convene another such assemblage from all the Christian denominations of the world, but with greater freedom to discuss matters of faith and order. And the challenge is said to have been promptly accepted with feelings of profound responsibility to the Master. At all events, some three months later, in October, at the meeting of the General Convention of that body, the following was introduced by the Rev. William T. Manning, D.D., of New York:

Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, that a Joint Committee, consisting of seven Bishops, seven Presbyters, and seven laymen, be appointed to take under advisement the promotion by this Church of a Conference following the general methods of the World Missionary Conference, to be participated in by representatives of all Christian bodies throughout the world which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, for consideration of questions pertaining to the Faith and Order of the Church of Christ, and that said Committee, if it deem such a Conference feasible, shall report to this Convention.

The Committee did report as follows:

Your Committee is of one mind. We believe that the time has now arrived when representatives of the whole family of Christ, led by the Holy Spirit, may be willing to come together for the consideration of questions of Faith and Order. We believe, further, that all Christian Communion are in accord with us in our desire to lay aside self-will, and to put on the mind which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. We would heed this call of the Spirit of God in all lowliness, and singleness of purpose. We would place ourselves by the side of our fellow Christians, looking not only to our own things, but also on the things of others, convinced that our one hope of a mutual understanding is in taking personal counsel together in the spirit of love and forbearance. It is our conviction that such a conference for the purpose of study and discussion, without power to legislate or to adopt resolutions, is the next step towards unity.

With grief for our aloofness in the past, and for other faults of pride and self-sufficiency, which make for schism; with loyalty to the truth as we see it, and with respect for the convictions of those who differ from us; holding the belief that the beginnings of unity are to be found in the clear statement and full consideration of those things in which we differ, as well as of those things in which we are at one, we respectfully submit the following resolution:

Whereas, there is today among all Christian people a growing desire for the fulfillment of our Lord's prayer that all His disciples may be one; that the world may believe that God has sent Him:

Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, that a joint Commission be appointed to bring about a Conference for the consideration of questions touching Faith and Order, and that all Christian Communion throughout the world which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour be asked to unite with us in arranging for and conducting such a Conference. The Commission shall consist of seven Bishops, and seven Presbyters, and seven Laymen, and shall have power to add to its number and to fill any vacancies occurring before the next general Convention.

Could anything be more beautiful and promising than the spirit and the plan set forth in these transactions of the Protestant Episcopal Church? Can we fail to see in it evidences of the working and leading of the Holy Spirit of the Lord in His Second Coming? And do we not find this especially in the single condition imposed upon those who are invited to join in preparing and conducting the Conference, namely, "all Christian Communion throughout the world

which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour"? It seems to provide the one practical and satisfactory basis for Christian unity suggested, as we have seen, by Messrs. Clissold and Spalding,—the Headstone of the corner without which all attempts at building the Church of Christ must be in vain, namely, the unity of God in the Lord Jesus Christ. We are not yet sure that the use of the phrase "confess our Lord Jesus Christ" is intended to go as far as this Gospel requirement leads. Still, we are hopeful that it will go quite far in this direction and help to prepare the way for successful building in the future. And the prayers which are recommended to be used in preparation for the Conference strengthen this hope. The first is addressed to the Lord Jesus as if He were the only God. It follows:

O Lord Jesus Christ, Who saidst unto Thine Apostles, Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you; regard not our sins, but the faith of Thy Church, and grant her that peace and unity which is agreeable to Thy will, Who livest and reignest God forever and ever. Amen.

A second prayer is in the old form of tripersonality, but it contains among others the following wholesome petitions:

Send Thy grace and heavenly blessing upon all Christian people who are striving to draw nearer to Thee and to each other in the unity of the Spirit and in the bond of peace. Give us penitence for our divisions, wisdom to know Thy truth, courage to do Thy will, love which shall break down the barriers of pride and prejudice, and an unswerving loyalty to Thy Holy Name.

The hopefulness of the movement is in its prayerful spirit, and its desire to cultivate a lowliness of heart and penitence for faults of aloofness, pride, and self-sufficiency, and to enter heartily and humbly into the relations of brotherly love which make for Christian unity.

Another indication that the movement is of the Lord's leading is found in the fact that simultaneously with this action of the Episcopal Church two other large communions took similar action, the Congregationalists and the Disciples of Christ. Receiving them into its counsels, and with their coöperation, the Episcopal Commission has extended

invitations to the Roman, Greek, and Anglican Catholic Churches, and to many Protestant denominations in this country and Europe. More than thirty organizations "who confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour" have responded favorably, and have appointed Commissions to take up the work of preparation for the Conference within their respective bodies. The preparation consists first of all in prayers for, and the cultivation of, the spirit of unity, or "the Conference spirit." This is to be accompanied by a campaign of education. Each denomination is to study its own belief in the light of the Sacred Scriptures, with a view to giving it as clear and helpful a presentation as possible when the Conference comes; and with a view to considering and receiving from others, in a spirit of brotherly regard, all helps to faith and order that commend themselves as true and useful.

Thus far, the New-Jerusalem Church has not received an invitation, as belonging to "the whole family of Christ," to participate. But recognizing as we must in the light of what has been said above, that this is a most important movement in the Christian world in preparation for the reception of the Lord Jesus Christ in His Second Coming as the one true God of heaven and earth "in Whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," we shall feel the deepest interest in it, and do all in our power to help it on to a successful result, even if no more opportunity be given than to add our prayers that it be filled and guided by the Lord's Holy Spirit, praying, "that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

H. C. H.

THE NINETY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION.

As they have looked back upon the recent Convention at Cincinnati, many of those who attended have felt that it was an unusually enjoyable and helpful session. In outline the

program was almost identical with that of the 1913 Convention in Boston, including the new features of that program (the religious service preparatory to Communion at the close of the Saturday evening meeting, and the vesper services Monday and Tuesday afternoons) which had proved so acceptable at that time. The President's call to Convention had voiced the 121st Psalm, and had urged those who contemplated attending to be mindful of the spirit of that Psalm. And the ministers and delegates and others who assembled in Cincinnati seemed responsive to this sentiment, which was sung with earnestness at least three times during the week,—at the meetings of the Council of Ministers and of the National Alliance of New-Church Women, as well as at the close of the final session of the Convention proper.

In accordance with the spirit of this Psalm, every one is agreed that one very noticeable feature of the Convention as a whole, was its inspirational character. The key-note was sounded in the discussion at the opening session of the Council of Ministers, on the subject "Our Mission to the World"; and again that evening in the sermon by Rev. Russell Eaton on "An Appointment to Meet the Lord." The message that the New Church has to proclaim to the world, the means of presenting that message by printed page and spoken word, the special functions of both clergy and laity in promoting the knowledge of that message, the factors in the ministers' preparation for effectively making known that message, the encouragement of the laymen to persist in their private missionary endeavors,—all these and many other things received earnest consideration. Full reports of these matters can be found in the columns of the June issues of the *New-Church Messenger*, the double "Convention Number" of June 10th giving the best report of a General Convention proper that has ever been presented to New-Church readers, while the other June issues deal adequately with the subsidiary meetings.

Of special value in the way of encouragement to the laity in their missionary work were the three remarkable addresses—remarkable not only separately but especially for

their unpremeditated unity—by the President and Rev. Messrs. John Goddard and Paul Sperry, the first at the opening session of Convention, and the latter two at the morning and evening services of Convention Sunday respectively. President Smyth laid stress upon “the press, the church, and the individual” as three obvious factors in promoting that good in the world for which the New Church stands. From Swedenborg’s own case he derived certain principles that should be borne in mind in all that we attempt to do with literature. The function of the organized church, and of our duty to that organization as the larger body of which we are constituent parts, furnishing to it of our substance and receiving from it spiritual nourishment; and the blessedness to the individual New-Churchman of living the truly Christian life, and of letting his light shine accordingly,—these also were dwelt upon. The Sunday morning sermon by Rev. Mr. Goddard (speaking again from the pulpit from which he had preached as pastor for thirty-five years) contrasted the twelve apostles of the Lord with the seventy disciples whom he sent out two by two, likening the twelve to the clergy of the New Church and the seventy to the laity, and laying stress upon the function of the laity in spreading the knowledge of the Lord’s Second Coming. Taking his text from the story of the restored demoniac who wished to remain with Him, but whom the Lord commanded, “Go home to thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compassion on thee,” Rev. Mr. Sperry spoke impressively on the intensive growth of the Church through the earnest work of faithful laymen.

In addition to the homiletical and other profitable discussions that had consumed the larger part of the special sessions of the Council of Ministers and the Alumni Association of the Theological School, the addresses by the President and by Rev. John F. Smith at the Conference of the Board of Home and Foreign Missions, which had been planned as an inspirational meeting, contained words of great encouragement for the minister and missionary. President Smyth’s theme was “The Heroism of New-Church Missionary

Work"; and Rev. Mr. Smith's was "The Need of Spiritual Support of Missionary Work by the Church." These were sufficiently in harmony with the stirring statement that Rev. Russell Eaton had made in his address nearly a week before: "I believe the time is ripe again for a fresh start; that a man who loves the doctrines and is willing to do the work of going out among the people with them, can build up a church of the New Jerusalem in any city in the land." Let the younger men entering the ministry take this to heart,—this and the assurance that while they are striving to build up a church in a new center, the Board of Missions will stand back of them, and when they have built up a society that can in considerable part support them, the Augmentation Fund Committee stands ready to assume its duty to contribute to the needed funds until the society is self-supporting.

But in addition to its inspirational quality, another feature of the Convention that stood out noticeably was that of constructiveness; not that there was anything very remarkable or novel in this respect, but yet there were several things worthy of note. Possibly most important was the proposed plan put forward in the report of the Literary Bureau (a modification of its plan set forth four years ago), to make a free gift of a reprint of the early chapters of Swedenborg's "True Christian Religion" to one hundred thousand of the Protestant clergymen and theological students in our land,—a plan involving for its successful accomplishment the coöperation of the Iungerich Trustees. Another important matter was the appointment by the Council of Ministers of a permanent Committee on Missionary Literature, whose duty it shall be "to make as comprehensive a survey as possible of the missionary literature already on hand, giving an outline of its scope and of the particular needs to which different books and pamphlets are adapted; to try to determine the types of missionary literature which are most needed at present; and to encourage or to arrange for the publication of appropriate works, in coöperation with the various publishing societies." While the duties of this new Committee apparently overlap those of at least two other special Committees,—the Literary

Bureau of Convention on the one hand, and the publication committee of the American New-Church Tract and Publication Society on the other (the latter, however, a body independent of Convention),—yet it would seem likely to entirely supersede the former of these, and to be far more effective.

Whether that special action by which our Sunday-School paper *Sunday Afternoons* is to be absorbed by the *New-Church Messenger*, is to be designated as constructive or not is perhaps open to question; but it is certainly constructive in intent, being planned to bring a new and valuable feature into every home where the *Messenger* comes, as well as to perform by reprints the same function as formerly performed by *Sunday Afternoons*, and (it is hoped) at a large saving of expense. The American New-Church Sunday-School Association is responsible for this consolidation.

The question of the Unification of Our Publishing Interests also received some earnest consideration; and the two papers presented upon the subject have been referred to the special committee of the General Council having this matter in charge. One of the plans proposed involved centralizing all our publishing interests in the hands of a certain secular publishing house as far as possible, and employing a special advertising agent and travelling salesman,—a plan apparently involving much expense and many complications. Another proposition was for a joint catalog for all our book-rooms.

Two entirely new matters that are probably destined to be recurring features in future sessions of the General Convention were, the meeting of the Sex Education League and the report of the Social Service Commission. The latter body is a part of Convention, having been appointed at the 1913 session. Its first annual report was received with much interest, and was followed by a vote of congratulations by the Convention. Though the Sex Education League appeared on the Convention program this year for the first time, it is an organization several years old. The officers of this league are thoroughly convinced that in the sex education movement now in progress, the New Church has an important

mission to perform, which can be performed only by some organized effort. The article on "The Literature of Sex Education" by Rev. H. C. Hay was reprinted from the April REVIEW at the expense of the League, and several hundred copies were distributed by mail. A number of matters involving action are in contemplation, and the interest of all New-Churchmen is solicited for this movement.

Another meeting which, like that of the Sex Education League, was relegated to an early hour before one of the morning sessions of Convention, was that of the New-Church Evidence Society, which has just rounded out its twentieth year. At this meeting a paper prepared by Rev. John Whitehead, on "Swedenborg's Influence in Spiritistic Circles," was read; and it was received with such favor that the Society voted to bear the expense of publication and distribution.

On its social side the recent Convention was most pleasant. The afternoon following the brief opening session of Convention, was devoted (as for some years past) to an outing,—this time to a trip up the Ohio River in a commodious steamboat especially designed for pleasure parties. Not to dwell upon the delights of the ride itself, the hours free from care on the river enabled old friends to mingle and converse with each other, and new acquaintances to be formed in abundance. This made the sociability of the entire Convention, and especially of the Reception on Monday evening at the "Mansion House," additionally enjoyable. Moreover, the warm hospitality of the Cincinnati people was greatly appreciated by all visitors throughout the entire session.

B. A. W.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

THE TRIBE OF LEVI.

A STUDY OF DEUTERONOMY x, 8, 9.

At that time the Lord separated the tribe of Levi, to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister unto him, and to bless in his name, unto this day. Wherefore Levi hath no part nor inheritance with his brethren; the Lord is his inheritance, according as the Lord thy God promised him. (Deut. x, 8, 9.)

No one can read far in the Word of the Lord, without seeing that great stress is laid on the names which find place in its pages. Often in the Scriptures, when a child is named, the reason is given why such or such a name was selected. Some fact connected with his birth or parentage, some personal characteristic of his own, some office which he is expected to fill, or some other distinctive feature of his career, is thus permanently associated with him. All through the Bible we are led to feel that names are intended to be much more than mere verbal designations. We think of them as being in a certain sense descriptive of the persons or things named. This is particularly evident in connection with the terms applied to the Lord, each of which throws special emphasis on some one attribute or aspect of His nature. For example: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel (God with us)." Or again: "Thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins" (Jesus meaning Jehovah Saviour). But these obvious instances only illustrate a general rule.

According to this ancient custom there was a reason mentioned, when each of Jacob's sons was named. The name was ever afterwards applied to the tribe whose progenitor he was. Thus we read regarding Levi, who is treated of in the text, that his mother Leah "conceived again, and bare a

son, and said, Now this time will my husband be joined unto me, because I have borne him three sons: therefore was his name called Levi," which is a Hebrew word that means "joining." Likewise when the next son was born, she said, "Now will I praise the Lord; therefore she called his name Judah"; which means "praise". And so on, throughout the list.

The tribe of Levi, as our text declares, was distinguished from all the other tribes by its special functions. It stood alone among the twelve, as being wholly devoted to the various offices of worship. Those who belonged to it were appointed "to bear the ark of the Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister unto him, and to bless in his name." Moreover, they had no separate apportionment of territory, as the others had, distinct from the rest. They were to live here and there, scattered throughout the land. Forty-eight cities in all were assigned to them, some from each of the tribes. Thus were the religious needs of the Israelites provided for. Among those cities were six in particular, which were known as cities of refuge. They furnished asylums to which a manslayer could flee, and where he could remain secure, until it should be proved whether he had committed his act intentionally or not. If he were shown to be a wilful murderer, he would be punished with death. But if he killed any person unawares, he would be safe, as long as he dwelt in the city to which he had fled for protection.

No great discernment is needed in order to see that the twelve tribes of Israel represent heaven and the Church. They represent heaven, because, in a natural sense, they were under the Lord's leadership, and subject to His laws. Their deliverance from Egypt and establishment in the land of Canaan are the recognized type of the way in which the Lord frees men from their evils, and assures to them the blessings of eternal life. They represent the Church, because the Church was designed to be a heaven upon earth,—the kingdom of God as it exists in this world. The twelve tribes signify all the varieties of good and truth which have place in the Church. The same thing is meant by the twelve apostles,

whom the Lord appointed to be the nucleus of the Christian Church at His coming. Peter denotes one element of spiritual life, James another, John another, and so on. Likewise the twelve descendants of Jacob, whose names were given to the tribes. Each of them stands for some spiritual quality which goes to constitute heaven and the Church in the mind of man.

What, then, we are led to ask, is signified by the tribe of Levi in this connection? What, if anything, is suggested by its literal sense of "joining"? Is there any essential characteristic of the Church, which, more than any other, joins and holds its members together in unity? Surely we cannot be mistaken in saying that this is the distinguishing effect of charity or mutual love. Charity is the great unifying influence among brethren. Only so far as charity prevails in the Church, can the latter be truly called the Lord's Church. Love for the neighbor, originating in love for the Lord, must needs be its all-pervading principle. Hence this is the spiritual Levi in the spiritual Israel, which, as we have seen, represents the true church to the end of time.

There was great significance in the fact that the tribe of Levi was not confined to any particular locality, as the other tribes were. The service which they performed was of a general character, equal for all. Wherefore, as has been mentioned, they were distributed throughout the country. In like manner, the element of charity, if it is to hold its proper place, must be universal. Not in any one part of the Church, but everywhere, its influence must be felt. No otherwise can it fulfill its purpose of making the whole church a living brotherhood. Levi, who has neither part nor inheritance with his brethren, is the chosen means whereby they all receive life and strength from the Lord.

Chief among the families of the tribe of Levi was that of Moses and Aaron. These two were brothers; and Aaron, as is known, was the first High Priest. From him, in lineal succession, came those who, throughout the generations, presided over the priestly office, as it was ordained to the chosen people. All the other Levites were under their direc-

tions. Hence a distinction between the priests and the Levites was commonly made. We do not need to be told that there must be a corresponding spiritual distinction. As Levi signifies neighborly love, with its conjunctive power, so does the house of Aaron signify love for the Lord, from which neighborly love receives its impulse. As the Levites were subordinate to the priests, so are the commandments which bring men into orderly relations with one another the means whereby the Lord's kingdom is fully established in human hearts. The priesthood, in its highest sense, represents the Lord in His office of Saviour. In His love and in His pity He redeems all those who trust in Him. But he does this work through the agency of truths which they must learn and practise in the experience of daily life, just as the Levites must be the servants of the priests in discharging their joint functions.

It is interesting to notice the particular functions of the Levites which are mentioned in the text. "To bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister unto him, and to bless in his name." Let us give to each of these points a few minutes' attention.

As regards the first named, "bearing the ark of the covenant of the Lord," it is to be remembered that the ark, with its sacred contents, held the central place in the Jewish religion and worship. Its contents were the two tables of stone, on which were inscribed the ten commandments. It was kept in the inmost recess of the tabernacle, and afterwards of the temple. When the people rested on their march through the wilderness, they encamped on all sides, round about, having the ark and tabernacle in the midst. When they journeyed, the tabernacle was taken down, and the ark carried in advance of them. So it was as the guide which they followed, imaging to them and to the Church in all ages the great truth that they are led by the Lord through obedience to His precepts. For the ten commandments are a brief summary of man's duty to God and his fellow-man. Hence they are called, as in our text, a covenant, that is, a compact or agreement, on which the relations of the Church

to the Lord are based. To bear the ark before the people, so that they might follow its guidance, is therefore a living picture of the spiritual service rendered by those whom the Levites represent.

The latter were also "to stand before the Lord to minister unto Him." That is to say, the spirit of mutual love must fill and vivify all worship. What is it to stand before the Lord, except to live in the consciousness of His presence? What is it to minister unto Him, except to hear and do as He teaches? Those stand before Him, who, like servants, await the commands of their master. Those minister unto Him, who having learned His wishes, execute them. He makes it plain what His wishes are. Service to the neighbor is loyalty to the Lord. "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." "If ye love me, keep my commandments." This is the sole condition of allegiance to Him whom we profess to worship, showing that we worship Him in spirit and in truth.

A third function assigned to the tribe of Levi was "blessing in the Lord's name." As His agent in the offices of devotion, that tribe was representative of the Lord Himself. The blessing which came forth from it was His blessing. Wherefore it was said to be imparted in His name. To do anything in another's name is to do it as from that other. The king's messenger or ambassador stands for the king in the country to which he is sent. The message which he delivers is not his own, but that of him who sent him. In like manner, the charity or brotherly love signified by the Levites is the fitting medium through which the Lord's spirit or influence is communicated. Proceeding from Him as its source, it prepares the way for the entrance of His truth and life into human souls. The blessing which it bears is eternal happiness. It blesses in His name, because it partakes of His quality. His quality, or that which truly describes Him and by which He is known, is in a spiritual sense His name. Those are blessed in His name, who, according to their finite capacity, share His Divine love and joy.

It is said respecting Levi, that he "has no part nor inherit-

ance with his brethren; the Lord is his inheritance, according as the Lord thy God promised him." Not only were the Levites separated from the other tribes on account of the holy uses which they performed, but they were free from the ordinary occupations and cares. They were not obliged to till the soil or tend cattle for their subsistence, but were supported by contributions from all the people. A tenth part of the produce of the land was reserved for them. Thus we read: "Behold, I have given the children of Levi all the tenth in Israel for an inheritance, for their service which they serve, even the service of the tabernacle of the congregation. Neither must the children of Israel come nigh the tabernacle of the congregation, lest they bear sin, and die. But the Levites shall do the service of the tabernacle of the congregation, and they shall bear their iniquity: it shall be a statute forever throughout your generations that among the children of Israel they have no inheritance."

The tithes collected for the benefit of the Levites were brought as offerings, not to them, but to the Lord. To them they came wholly as gifts from Him. Thus is taught the twofold lesson that all we have is His, to be held subject to His service, and that we are utterly dependent on Him for life and all its blessings. Those who cherish this belief can truly say that the Lord is their inheritance, and that they need no other. Let us then try to keep alive within ourselves that principle of the Church which joins its members together in fraternal unity. Though we have looked but a little way below the surface meaning of our text, we have surely looked far enough to perceive the glimmering of brighter light than the mere letter discloses. We have had the fact brought home to us that even in Scripture names lies hidden spiritual and enduring truth. So let us sing in the words of the Psalm, knowing that they were written for all time: "Bless the Lord, O house of Israel: bless the Lord, O house of Aaron: bless the Lord, O house of Levi."

JAMES REED.

THE LORD'S PHYSICAL AND RESURRECTION
BODY.

CALLS have come for a reply to Mr. Wethey's study of the Lord's Physical and Resurrection Body, printed in the last number of the REVIEW. It was published in the department of Studies because it sets forth a view of the subject which has existed with some variety in the New Church from the beginning, but has never had much of a following, as is intimated by Mr. Wethey himself in his opening paragraph. It was published, not because the editors of the REVIEW agree with it, but in order that all sides of the matter might have a hearing, and that further study of it might be encouraged. For it is, indeed, the most precious of all subjects, since it relates to the coming of the Lord to men with all the gifts of redemption and salvation, and, when properly understood, enables us to realize how the Lord is present with us on earth even down to the flesh and bones of our material bodies.

Mr. Wethey has presented the view, as he himself says, which was first suggested by the Rev. John Clowes of Manchester. Richard M'Cully, in his admirable volume of "Swedenborg Studies" (Chapter V), calls it the "Identity Theory" as opposed to that of the Rev. Robert Hindmarsh, which he calls the "Dissipation Theory." Mr. William Mason vigorously championed the former, and the Rev. Samuel Noble the latter. M'Cully speaks of Mr. Clowes as "the child-hearted rector of St. John's" and says that "his theory carries with it a charming simplicity and scripturality" (p. 130). He held, in opposition to Hindmarsh, that the Lord's material body was not dissipated, but glorified; that "the Blessed Jesus rose from the grave with the same identical body of flesh and bones which had been laid in the grave"; that its glorification consisted in its being derived from the Divine in Himself wholly, and not a particle of it from Mary. Whether any of it had ever been derived from Mary or not Mr. Clowes does not make clear; but he dwells upon the putting forth of the body from the Divine soul

given from the Father. Thus the body, as M'Cully says, "had an immediate Divine origin, being formed successively from a Divine soul, thus partaking of Divine qualities which completely distinguished it from all other bodies whether of men or angels" (p. 132).

Mr. Hindmarsh agreed with this in saying that the glorified body of the Lord was formed successively by the putting forth of a Divine substantial body from His Divine soul, thus partaking of the Divine qualities which completely distinguished it from all other bodies whether of men or angels; but he differed in holding that a material body from the mother was necessary as a receptacle of the Divine body in the process of being put forth; and in holding that this Mary-born material body could not enter into the composition of the Divine substantial body because matter is not Divine substance, but has been so separated from it as to act as a receptacle of a creation that is not God but is from Him, and so distinct as not to be Divine. The reasoning is stated as follows by M'Cully:

The Divine of the Lord is presented to us in the Scriptures in three distinct points of view: 1) as existing before the incarnation; 2) as dwelling in a mere humanity, assumed in the world; 3) as an all-glorified body, perfectly human, yet at the same time perfectly Divine.

1) In the first case the Divine was an emanation from the Divine Essence flowing into and through the heavens, and capable of being perceived therein only through the medium of some angelic form.

2) In the second case there was the same emanation, but descending now from the heavens, and through the world of spirits, into the natural world, there to clothe itself with natural substances. This was the Word made flesh—the Lord Jesus Christ.

3) We now come to the third point of view. Here all the evils, infirmities, affections, propensities, together with all the substances and forms inherited and derived from the mother and finite nature, were completely removed, expelled, and exterminated from the Person of the *Word made Flesh*; and in their stead were substituted, and permanently fixed, Divine Substances, Forms, and Human Principles,—all from the pure and essential Divinity within Him as His soul. (pp. 137-139.)

The advocates of the Identity Theory agree with the last statement (3) so far as the mental inheritance from Mary

is concerned, but they disagree with regard to the substances and material forms derived from her and finite nature. Just what M. Clowes thought about this is not very clear; but his followers have tried to meet the difficulty. William Mason argued that all the paternal forms were Divine Principles; but that the maternal forms were only tendencies, which were rejected and never received into the formation of the Lord's Human nature and body; so that all that entered into their formation was Divine from the beginning: this seems to mean that there was nothing but a Divine Human—the glorification of which consisted in its progressive development. Nothing was accepted that needed to be put off; and all that Swedenborg is understood to mean when he speaks of the maternal that was expelled and dissipated is the rejection of tendencies to evil in the forms of the mind. M'Cully says of it the following:

These Divine forms made their substance to be substantial,—or incapable of change,—consequently not liable to corruption: thus when the fully glorified body was taken down from the cross it was an aggregate of such paternal forms only; and therefore, at the resurrection, the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in it. It was entombed Divine Natural, and it rose Divine Natural. (p. 133.)

It is remarkable that the three writers who have been prominent advocates of this theory have been of Manchester, England. The third was the late Jonathan Robinson, to whose book, published in 1909, Mr. Wethey acknowledges he is much indebted. His argument is that the Lord had a mental human from the mother, but not a physical. Let us read his own words:

There can be no doubt that the "Body or human from the mother" (Apocalypse Explained, n. 1108), assumed at the incarnation, included substances taken from the natural world; but we are not aware that Swedenborg ever deals with these as *mere matter*. He constantly refers to the body and its qualities derived from the Virgin, and assures us that this human was "put off in the world," and a Human from the Father put on, which is the Divine Human. Various are the expressions used to indicate what was put off. Sometimes we read of "the infirm," or the "infirm human"; then of the "maternal human," or the "human from the mother," also the "human derived from the

mother," and the "natural human." But reference to these numerous passages will convince the reader or student that Swedenborg is chiefly dwelling upon mental qualities or states received from the mother at birth. . . . The "maternal human" is identical with the "human derived from the mother," as is evident from these words: "The Lord's internal man was Jehovah Himself, of whom He was conceived, and whose only Son He was; to whom the Human of the Lord became united, after He had purified, by temptation combats, the maternal human, or that which He derived from the mother (*quod a matre traxit*)". (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1793.)

Let us, however, inquire what it was that was really "derived from the mother." It was the "merely human," which is meant by the Son of Mary, and which had to be put off. It was the mother's image, imprint, and heredity in the Son that she bare. Matter itself, in this strict sense, was *not derived* from her, although it was provided in her; its origin is God. (The Lord Tempted, Risen, and Glorified. By Jonathan Robinson, pp. 58 and 59.)

But although Robinson held that the material or physical body of the Lord was not in the strictest sense derived from Mary, but was provided in her by God for His own incarnation,—which is always true of everything but the evil forms given by man to what God creates,—still, he seems not to deny that even the material body was formed out of matter by means of Mary, and not immediately from the Divine; and he admits that it needed to be separated in the process of glorification; yet he seems to object to the postponement of the dissipation until in the tomb,—as Dr. Burnham appears to explain it in his work on "Discrete Degrees." But possibly he misunderstands Dr. Burnham, for we have never supposed him to mean that there were not some changes going on in the Lord's body all through life on earth which made it different from other bodies, and made it possible for Him to walk on the sea, and filled His touch, and even the hem of His garments, with the sphere of a Divine Natural substance. We have simply understood him to teach that this process was completed in the sepulchre and the "residue from the mother," both material and psychical, was then put off, separated, or dissipated.

And this leads us to mention Mr. Wethey's discussion of the term "dissipate." It never had occurred to us before that

any one could think of its being used to mean *annihilation*. When evils are dissipated they are never annihilated. They are simply separated and left in the hells, embodied in evil spirits, where they belong. To annihilate them would be to annihilate the evil spirits in whom they are embodied; and we know that the infinitely merciful Creator could never do that. Hence, when the Lord dissipated the evils and falsities derived from Mary by inheritance He did not destroy them, but He put them, and all the infernal host who had access to Him by means of them, into order in their hells; and thus took a new control over them for their own good, as well as for the good of the heavens, forever. And so was it with regard to the dissipation of the material elements of His body derived from, or provided in, Mary. There was no annihilation of them, but they were returned to their own according to the Divine order in the creation and preservation of the natural universe. But the relation of indwelling into which the Lord had entered with them, was not thus terminated; it was only extended to all the rest of matter and made universal by means of the glorification of His Divine Substantial Body.

How can we think of the process as an identification of the Divine Substance with matter, or of matter with the Divine Substance? To do so would be to throw down all the distinctions of discrete degrees between the Creator and His creation. But to take the opposite course is to think in conformity with the descent of the Human Divine through the successive discrete degrees of heavenly order. For in the formation of the celestial heavens the Lord clothed His Divine Love with the good of the angels, but not in such a way as to identify Himself with the angels, or the angels with Himself; they were kept distinct by a discrete degree in every heart-throb and every activity. And so was it with the formation of the spiritual heavens: the Human Divine descended and clothed Itself with the thoughts of the angels, but the relation of discrete degrees was still maintained, the law of correspondences was maintained, the relation of cause and effect continued; the Divine wisdom was in all their

thinking, and yet their thinking was not Divine—their thoughts were not the Lord's thoughts, neither were the Lord's theirs. The Divine of the Lord made heaven for them—for nothing of their own could make it, and nevertheless in all things they were kept distinct from Him for the sake of their individuality. Their spiritual bodies and their spiritual environment, the whole spiritual world, was kept distinct—if it had been made identical with the Divine Substance nothing would have been left but God alone. And must it not have been so when the Lord took the next step of incarnation, coming into the plane of the natural world by means, not only of an earthly nature, but also—for the sake of the indispensable power of ultimates—of an earthly body? By birth of the Virgin He entered into and clothed Himself with the three planes of the material universe; but He did not identify Himself with them—if He had done so He would have made all Nature Divine; He would have returned all the finite to the Infinite; and instead of God's becoming man, man would have become God. But the fact was that the Divine Substance became incarnate and dwelt in matter, even down to its last ultimates of the flesh and the bones, without becoming identical with it and sweeping away all distinctions of discrete degrees; which was impossible by the very nature of the Divine Substance as Life Itself, and by the very nature of the material universe as non-life itself. It is difficult to find earthly words to describe it, but this is what we understand "dissipation," "expulsion," "laying aside," and all such expressions to mean in this connection: they mean the extension of the indwelling of this Divine Substance, from the body of Mary's Son, into the whole material universe of earthly bodies and earthly natures, so that the tabernacle of God is with men even down to the flesh and bones, and the mineral kingdom,—so that the Lord is the *Omega* as well as the *Alpha*,—distinct by discrete degrees in every plane; and yet, under the law of correspondences, operating as the immediate Divine Cause in every natural effect and phenomenon.

Mr. Wethey's use of radioactivity as an illustration is

interesting and clever; but radioactivity, it should be remembered, operates only in its own plane and never from one discrete degree into another; moreover Swedenborg teaches that the operations of the Lord in creating and sustaining the universe are carried on by influx; and that influx is always from Him as the Source of life and substance, and therefore always downward, or outward, through the successive discrete degrees of the spiritual and natural worlds, and never the reverse,—as Mr. Wethey would have it if matter itself were to be “transformed,” or “transmuted,” into Divine Substance. Thus we read:

That the external is reformed by the internal, is, that the internal flows into the external, and not the reverse. That there is influx of the spiritual into the natural, and not the reverse, is known in the learned world; and that the internal man must be first purified and renewed, and so the external, is known in the church; it is known because the Lord teaches it, and reason dictates it. (*Divine Providence*, n. 150.)

That the Lord created all things by the living sun, and not by the dead sun, is evident from the consideration, that what is living disposes at pleasure what is dead, and forms it for uses, which are its ends; but not contrariwise. No rational person can think that all things, and even life itself, are from nature: he who so thinks does not know what life is. Nature cannot dispense life to anything, being in itself altogether inert. It is entirely contrary to order for what is dead to act on what is living, or for a dead power to act on a living power, or, what is the same thing, for natural to act on what is spiritual, and therefore to think so is contrary to the light of sound reason. What is dead, or natural, may indeed in many ways, by external accidents, be perverted or changed; but still it cannot act on life, but life acts on it, according to the change induced in its form: the same is true with respect to physical influx into the spiritual operations of the soul, which, it is well known, does not exist because it is impossible. (*Divine Love and Wisdom*, n. 166.)

There are three heavens, and these distinct by degrees of altitude, so that one heaven is under another; and they do not communicate with each other but by influx, which proceeds from the Lord through the heavens in their order to the lowest, and not contrariwise. (*Ibid.*, n. 186.)

We understand these passages to teach that the substances of higher discrete degrees can be transformed into those of lower, in the processes of creation, but not the

reverse. And as we know that in becoming incarnate the Lord conformed to the laws of His own Divine order in creation, we cannot accept a theory which ignores this law of influx by discrete degrees downward only, and explains the glorification by a reversal of it, by which matter is not transformed into spirit merely, but passing beyond this impossibility in the very nature of things, is transformed into the Divine Substance Itself from which it was created.

We find a difficulty also with Mr. Wethey's statement that the Lord's body, according to Swedenborg, was not a part of the "maternal human." It is a matter of interpretation, to be sure; but we do not see how the expression "maternal human" can be so interpreted in the light of the following:

To the above [explanation of the Incarnation] I will add this arcanum. The soul which is from the father, is the man himself, and the body which is from the mother, is not the man in itself, but is from him. The body is only a covering of the soul, composed of such things as are of the natural world; but the soul is of such things as are in the spiritual world. Every man, after death, lays down the natural which he had from the mother, and retains the spiritual which he had from the father, together with a kind of border of the purest things of nature, around it. (True Christian Religion, n. 103.)

Mr. Wethey speaks of the evils and falsities derived from Mary as not being of the body; but Swedenborg teaches in the above, that only the body was from her—the body including the envelope of purest substances of nature, the border, or limbus. Now we know that the limbus in the receptacle of the mind, which is formed by the mind in the body. All evils and falsities, therefore, from Mary were in the limbus, the forms of which "straitened," or distressed, tempted, the mind of the Lord, which was from the Father. Swedenborg teaches how all heredity of evil and falsity consists in the twisting of the spiral activities of the limbus, in which the mind rests as a house upon its foundations. Regeneration consists in turning and twisting these spirals in the opposite direction back into harmony with the spiritual mind (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 270); the Lord's glorification must have taken place in a similar manner—by

changing the direction of the spirals in the limbus—all that He had from Mary that could occasion the appearances of evil and falsities to the celestial and spiritual substances of the Divine mind from the Father. It was this body (including the limbus), then, derived by birth from Mary, which had to be rejected; and a body (including the limbus) of Divine Substance projected in its place.

This interpretation is, we understand, substantially that of Hindmarsh, Noble, and Burnham. It seems to us to require no straining of the language of Swedenborg, as the Identity Theory does. We, therefore, are led to favor it.

H. C. H.

CURRENT LITERATURE

"THE BOOK OF NUMBERS."*

WITH Mr. Maclagan's similar work, "The Two Books of Kings Explained," the Church has been familiar several years now; not long ago it had placed in its hands the "Leviticus" of this same impressive series. Now "Numbers" is issued; and the preface to it leads us to expect the appearance soon of "Deuteronomy" also, Mr. Maclagan, on his death, having presumably left the manuscript of it.

The general plan of the work on *Numbers* is as follows. A summary of the spiritual sense of each chapter is placed at the head of the same. In parallel columns then follow the Revised Version of the literal text and a verse-by-verse explication of the spiritual sense, the latter thus making a continuous statement of that sense. Each chapter is concluded with copious references, almost wholly to the "Arcana Cœlestia," establishing the interpretation of each verse, or confirming the teaching involved in the explication. Finally come notes, reflections on the significance of the chapter as a whole, especially on its significance for man's life.

In his preface Mr. Maclagan argues the value and advantages of this scheme; use of the book proves them. For from a general view of a chapter's contents, concisely put, the reader proceeds both expectantly and intelligently to a study of the meaning of each verse, the references on which he can turn to at once if he wishes; all the time he has the literal text open before him; and at length he finds the meaning of the chapter summed up for him again, from some particular point of view,

**The Book of Numbers, Interpreted and Explained According to Its Spiritual or Internal Sense.* By the REV. HENRY MACLAGAN. London: James Speirs. 1913. 594 pp., 8vo. \$3.50.

or to some practical end. The concluding notes often make the precise and rather abstract explication which precedes them astonishingly simple and warm. They are even hortatory often. The notes upon vv. 11-16 of Chapter xix. run in part as follows:

What, spiritually, is the dead body of a man? It is an evil state that has been acknowledged, repented of, and rejected. And how do we accidentally or otherwise touch that "dead body"? We do so when the thought of that evil recurs. And what is our duty in this case? We must again and again reject evil with abomination and horror. . . We may become a tabernacle of the Lord, that is, we may be in genuine worship. But also we may at that time touch the body of a dead man; we may, that is, indulge in an evil thought. What shall we then do? We must purify ourselves with the water of separation, that is, we must strengthen the acknowledgment that, of ourselves, we are nothing but evil; or we may. . . fall back into actual sin. Let us, then, pray to the Lord and choose the better part. (p. 317.)

Of this practical nature quite constantly, the notes also enter into more academic studies, as where, on p. 133, they deal with the question how far the divisions of the literal text into chapters agree with the transitions in subject of the spiritual sense; or as on p. 145, where an illuminating interpretation is given of the Hebrew word variously translated "beaten work" and "turned work" in the Versions, and in the "*Arcana Cœlestia*" "solid"; or as on p. 432, where the two numberings of the people are compared in their spiritual significance.

The plan is thorough; the work done in pursuance of it. laborious it must have been, bears evidence on even partial reading and study, of exacting thoroughness. The book is a piece of colossal industry, to begin with, but it called for a capacity far less easily commanded than industry—namely, perception of the inner sense of the Word. It is here that we are most likely to falter before the author's enterprise. But why not this sustained power of seeing the spiritual sense of the Word in its own series? Surely the New-Churchman is only loyal, to expect the gift of this power to men. Mr. Maclagan himself argues for the possibility of working out the series of the spiritual sense in any portion of the Word.

He quotes from "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 4402³,—"A time is about to come when there will be illustration." Nothing, however, will bear him out personally in the matter better than will his own actual accomplishment of this book.

The seeker after living water of truth in the Word regards portions of "Numbers" doubtless as arid waste. The theory that there is water there may ward off such a view. But the actual proffer of the water alone reclaims the seeming waste. This proffer Mr. Maclagan makes. The reader may wish to judge for himself. We give here what Mr. Maclagan has to say of Num. v. 1-4 under each division of his text.

(Summary of the Spiritual Sense)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1. And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,</p> | <p>1. There is revelation from the Lord by Divine Truth giving the perception,</p> |
| <p>2. Command the children of Israel, that they put out of the camp every leper, and every one that hath an issue, and whosoever is unclean by the dead:</p> | <p>2. That the man of the Spiritual Church, by the influx of Divine Good and the power of Divine Truth, must reject from himself every tendency disposing him to profane the truth, falsify it, or defile it by contact with any natural affection void of spiritual life.</p> |
| <p>3. Both male and female shall ye put out, without the camp shall ye put them; that they defile not their camp, in the midst whereof I dwell.</p> | <p>3. And this must be done both with regard to falsity and evil, for these are to be separated from the heavenly life, and rejected to hell, because they destroy heavenly order which is entirely from the Lord, and in which the Lord has His abode with man inmosty.</p> |
| <p>4. And the children of Israel did so, and put them out without the camp: as the Lord spake unto Moses, so did the children of Israel.</p> | <p>4. And the man of the true church is obedient to the dictate of Divine Truth, and entirely rejects these evil things, because he is able to do this from Divine Good by Divine Truth, which he acknowledges to be from the Lord.</p> |

WM. F. WUNSCH.

"THE BIBLE IN THE MAKING." *

THE title page of the volume before us—"The Bible in the Making, in the light of modern research"—gives us a little information concerning the standing of the author (see footnote below). We suspect that he is best known to the general reading public, however, because of his work entitled "How We Got Our Bible," which has been long on the market, and which has attained sales of many thousand copies. That little book tells in popular form the story of the old manuscripts of the Bible, and of the various translations that have led up to the English Bible as we have it today. The present volume on the other hand deals with a far more interesting, far more important, far more fundamental problem, and endeavors to answer such questions concerning the Bible as:

How did we originally get this collection of books, history and biography and letters and sermons and poetry and drama? When and where was the ultimate beginning of them? Had they any existence before they were written in the Bible? Who wrote them? Who collected them? Who selected them? By what test were they selected out of the literature of the time? . . . How does it happen that these particular books and no other should be regarded as specially inspired and be collected into an authoritative Bible?

The author considers these questions in a scholarly yet reverent way, and tells his story in just the way that multitudes of thoughtful readers, cherishing their faith in the divinity of the Sacred Scriptures and yet puzzled and perhaps distressed by the Higher Criticism, have long desired. He aims to show that there is no good reason why the general "results" of critical scholarship may not be accepted, and at the same time one's faith in the Bible as a God-inspired book be retained. As these are matters with which New-Churchmen need to be acquainted, we can heartily

**The Bible in the Making, in the light of modern research.* By J. PATERSON SMYTH, B.D., Litt.D., D.C.L., Archdeacon of St. Andrew's, Montreal, Late Professor of Pastoral Theology in the University of Dublin. New York: James Pott & Co. 1914. 219 pp., 12mo., illus. 75 cents net.

commend this volume to their attention. Not that they will accept all the statements that the author makes (for after all is said, the "results" of the Higher Criticism are merely theories); but as a special function that the New Church is to perform, is to reestablish faith in the Word of the Lord more firmly and unshakably than ever before, it is well for New-Churchmen to acquaint themselves somewhat with what has shaken men's faith. The author deals with such disturbing matters fearlessly and frankly; but he still leaves the Bible before us as a God-inspired book.

The larger part of this volume is devoted to a consideration of the Old Testament. At one point, where the discussion has brought him to the time of the Babylonian exile, he summarizes the steps that have gone before; and as this summary makes clear the author's position, it will be well to present it here, as follows:

Behind the Bible was a religious community called by God for His great purposes to humanity, and in which, as in a cherishing home or nest, the Bible was to grow. In this community, in the Providence of God, arose a primitive literature mainly with a religious purpose,—songs and legends and laws and histories, etc. Later came written collections and selections of this old literature, to what extent we know not—such as the Book of Jasher and the Book of the Wars of Jehovah, etc. Still later, as the need arose, came fuller books, the Four "Bibles before the Bible"—like the Four Gospels in the New Testament, committing to writing, just as the Gospels did, a selection of the oral and fragmentary written records of the past. Besides these there was much other literature, in which most important of all were the inspired utterances of the Prophets. [BUT] THERE WAS NO BIBLE YET, in our solemn sense of the word; only religious literature of varying spiritual value in which some parts stood out more prominently in the estimation of the faithful. The reason of this prominence was the silent conviction that God was more behind these parts, that they revealed the nature and will of God in an especial manner and degree. This conviction came not through any external authority, through any miraculous attestation or any formal decision, but through the persistent appeal of the books or utterances themselves to the Spirit-guided conscience of the community in which they grew. Slowly, gradually, unconsciously that community was making a selection. By the quiet influence of the Holy Spirit on their minds they were preparing for the making of the Bible. (pp. 106-8.)

Then he tells us that the exigencies of the Captivity led to the making of a compilation from all this literary matter, and that the first Jewish Bible, the Pentateuch, was thus written. Subsequently, about two hundred years after the return from the Exile, the collection of the Prophets became officially recognized as part of the Holy Scriptures inspired by God. Finally, and but little more than a century before the birth of our Lord, the Psalms and the remaining books of our Bibles gained more or less canonical authority.

We need not here go into his interesting consideration of the Apocrypha and of the New Testament. The theory and the treatment are the same as in the earlier part of the book. The summary statement at the end, however, again seems worthy of presentation, as follows:

So we close our story of the Making of the Bible. In one sense it has shown us that the Church made the Bible. The Church by her great sons received the inspired words; the Church through many ages decided its contents. But I trust it has shown more clearly the awe-inspiring truth that the Bible was made for man by the Holy Spirit of God. He it was who gave the holy words to His Church. He it was who by His silent influence on that Church decided what its contents should be. Surely it was no chance that made the Canon of Scripture. For if anything is clearly taught by this story it is this, which I said at its beginning, that the Canon of Scripture was formed not suddenly by some startling miracle, not officially by some decision of Synod or Bishop or prophet or saint, but slowly, gradually, half unconsciously, by the quiet influence of the Holy Spirit on the minds of men in the Church. (p. 218.)

Though our author thus maintains that our Bible does not necessarily seem to lose anything of its divinity when viewed in the light of the Higher Criticism, yet it is certain that many men's faith in the Bible as the Word of the Lord has been completely undermined by such considerations when carried on in a destructive spirit. It is no wonder. Scepticism is older than the Bible itself. It has been especially rife of recent generations. Swedenborg announced the increasing disintegration of faith as inevitable; and he proclaimed his own function as that of reëstablishing the faith of the New Age on the impregnable rock of Scripture.

Our author has laid stress upon the fact that the statements of Jesus Christ and his Apostles concerning the Old Testament (Luke xxiv, 44; and elsewhere) are surety for our own faith; but he naturally fails to call attention to those passages in the New Testament that are so supremely significant to a New-Churchman:

"And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself

"Then opened he their minds that they might understand the scriptures." (Luke xxiv, 27, 45.)

Every New-Churchman knows that these statements involve an internal sense in the letter of Scripture; and he also knows that it is the presence of this internal sense that constitutes the criterion of the canonicity of any book of the Word. Whatever may have been the details of the actual "making of the Bible," we have within the covers of the sacred volume a collection of books, of which the larger number were inspired by the Lord, contain an internal sense throughout, and are distinctly different from any other literature in the possession of humanity. Swedenborg alone makes clear why this is so; he alone, as the instrument of the Lord in His new revelation to humanity, makes known the internal sense of the Sacred Scripture, thus establishing the Divinity of the Word conclusively and for all time.

B. A. W.

"THE INFLUENCE OF THE BIBLE ON CIVILIZATION." *

In his brief history of the influence of the Bible upon Christian civilization, Professor von Dobschütz has produced a very interesting book. It is apparently the forerunner of a voluminous work which the author has in mind to write in

**The Influence of the Bible on Civilization.* By ERNST VON DOBSCHÜTZ, D.D., Professor of the New Testament in the University of Halle-Wittenberg. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1914. 190 pp., 12mo., illustrated. \$1.25 net.

German; and as we presumably have in the present volume an outline of what the projected work will be, and as this present volume is written in a clear and entertaining style, it is just the thing for the general reader to whom the subject may appeal. It is of small size, and it is easy reading; moreover the claim is made that the treatise is unique.

With some overlapping, the periods covered by the eight chapters which make up the volume are divided approximately by the dates 325, 600, 800, 1150, 1450, 1650, and 1850, the chapter-headings being as follows: *The Bible Makes Itself Indispensable for the Church*; *The Bible Begins to Rule the Christian Empire*; *The Bible Teaches the German Nations*; *The Bible Becomes One Basis of Mediæval Civilization*; *The Bible Stirs Non-Conformist Movements*; *The Bible Trains Printers and Translators*; *The Bible Rules Daily Life*; and *The Bible Becomes Once More the Book of Devotion*.

In this treatise there are many things to interest us. From our standpoint as members of a democracy, for instance, the fifth chapter is of especial interest, because in the non-conformist movements there dealt with, we see the roots of modern democracy. Although in the earliest days of Christianity the Sacred Scriptures were open to all who could read, the growth of ecclesiasticism through the dark ages when the knowledge of how to read and the inclination for scholarship were uncommon, led to the erection of various barriers by the clergy when the desire for first-hand knowledge again began to assert itself among the people. Hence in 1199 Pope Innocent III uttered his pronouncement, that while "the study of the Bible is to be encouraged among the clergy, . . . all laymen are to be kept from it, the Bible being so profound in its mysteries that even scholars get beyond their depth and are drowned." But in spite of such prohibitions, and in spite too of the church's vigorous persecution of the translators and printers of the earliest Bibles in the vernacular, the popular movement still went on, leading to a progressive subordination of the clergy, and subsequently of royalty.

This popular, anti-ecclesiastical movement it was which led in due time to the general establishment of schools for the education of the young (the forerunners of the public schools of our own day), with a view primarily to an educated clergy and laity among the Protestants. And certain higher institutions of learning, such as Harvard College, also owed their establishment to the same tendency.

But to a New-Churchman perhaps the most significant feature of the book,—an aspect that keeps showing itself throughout the earlier half of the treatise,—is the fact that there were frequent attempts at symbolic interpretation of the Bible. In the very first chapter, for instance, speaking of Origen (186-253 A.D.), whom he designates as “the greatest Bible scholar of his time, if not of all times,” our author says:

Origen’s great merit is that he brought Christian interpretation to a system which enabled the church to retain the plain historical sense alongside the so-called higher meaning. For a long time gentile philosophers as well as Jewish preachers had adopted the method of treating their sacred books allegorically. . . . Christianity tried to follow in this path. The gnostics indulged in the wildest form of allegory. But it was not safe to give up the idea of historicity altogether. . . . Origen saved the situation by asserting that each of these two views had its proper place. His theory is that as man consists of body, soul, and spirit, so the holy Scripture has a threefold nature, to which corresponds a threefold interpretation. The body stands for the plain historical meaning: Jesus did cast out of the temple those that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the changers of money. . . . The soul represents the higher moral view: Christ is always casting out of his church, which belongs to the heavenly Jerusalem, the men who are profaning it by their money-making. And, lastly, there is the spirit, that is, the supreme mystical understanding. The spirit of Christ, entering its temple, the man’s soul, casts out of it all earthly desires and makes it a house of prayer Origen succeeds by this method in keeping the essential historical basis and adding what in those days was thought to be most significant. The Bible, being a divine book, seemed to require a higher form of interpretation; the Holy Ghost of God was supposed to be a spirit of mysteries; it was assumed that to interpret the Bible in a plain way was to think of God meanly. (pp. 18-20.)

There is evidence that Origen wrote a complete commentary of the Bible along such lines. Doubtless this

method of interpretation among the early Christians was due, not to the gentile philosophers and Jewish preachers alluded to above, but to tradition from the original Apostles, whose understandings had been opened by the Lord, "that they might understand the scriptures" (Luke xxiv, 44, 45).

Attempts at figurative interpretation continued for centuries, in fact never wholly died out. In the second chapter, for instance, when dealing with the development of the clergy and of ecclesiastical forms, our author shows what an effect upon this development the symbolic interpretation of the Old and the New Testament had. Later, in the fourth chapter, we find imagination and fancy dealing in all sorts of ways with Biblical data; for though there was not at that period a great deal of reading of the Bible, yet on a basis of Biblical themes there was progress in the arts of painting, sculpture, drama, etc., that helped to usher in the Renaissance. As mentioned above, the fifth chapter tells of various important movements that owed their growth to the increasing desire on the part of the people for Bible knowledge at first hand; moreover, it informs us that the ecclesiastics of the time, who frowned upon these popular movements, "treated the Bible as a book of secrets," for the proper understanding of which "one had to be initiated into the art of interpreting everything by allegory according to the authority of the fathers" (p. 96). But with popular knowledge there was a growing tendency to stick to the letter of Scripture; and with the success of Protestantism there came a general insistence upon taking the Bible in its literal sense. Wherever there were persons of mystical inclinations, however, the symbolic method of interpretation persisted; and as recently as Swedenborg's own time we have the case of the French mystic, Mme. Guyon (1648-1717), writing an exposition of the mystical sense of the entire Bible.

Turning to the last chapter, we find our author naturally laying stress on the "results" of modern Biblical scholarship. In the opening paragraph he says that, while the present circulation of the Bible exceeds anything in the past, "it

seems to have lost most of its influence." Further on he says, "Today the principles of literary criticism in their application to the Bible are generally acknowledged. The books of the Bible are like other books; they are not to be treated as divine Scriptures but as human writings" (p. 183). To be sure he makes some brief remarks towards the close in palliation of such statements, laying stress upon the value of the "inward inspiration given by devotional reading of the Bible;" but we suspect that his judgment estimates the Bible as a book of the past rather than as the book of the future. As New-Churchmen we have no occasion to be troubled by such judgments. Swedenborg was fully acquainted with a similar attitude of mind in his day; and he knew that that attitude was to become very prevalent. On the other hand, to him as to no other man in all history the real Divinity of the Word of the Lord was disclosed by the revelation to him of the Word's true internal sense, a sense not based upon fanciful interpretation of rhetorical figures of man's devising, but an internal sense made clear by the key of the science of correspondences, a science by which it is possible to demonstrate "the Divinity and Holiness of the Word, and convince even the natural man, if he is willing to be convinced" (Doctrine of Sacred Scripture, n. 4). This proves that the Bible is the book of the future far more than of the past.

B. A. W.

MARTIN LUTHER'S CORRESPONDENCE.*

DURING the past ten years an unusual activity has arisen in the publication of books concerning Martin Luther. Many of them have revived the old controversial spirit which prevailed more than a generation ago, and which on the one hand exalted him into an angel of light and on the other debased him into a demon of darkness. In weighing these

**Luther's Correspondence and other Contemporary Letters.* Translated and edited by Preserved Smith, Ph.D. Volume I, 1507-1521. Philadelphia: The Lutheran Publication Society, 1913. 583 pp., 8vo. \$3.50 net.

extreme estimates of his character and work, New-Churchmen will not forget that Swedenborg calls him the Prince of the Reformation, and while he shows something of the hard things through which he had to pass in getting rid of the evils which are common to human nature, still he speaks hopefully of the underlying motives of his life as showing a sincere love of truth and righteousness. But when Roman Catholics and Protestants are struggling in sectarian controversy, it helps to clear the atmosphere to have first-hand documents translated and given to the English reader. For this service we are indebted to Dr. Smith, who has undertaken the work. And for it he is especially qualified by his recent studies in writing his "Life and Letters of Martin Luther," published in 1911. But it is to be remembered that it is more than the life of a single man that is given in these letters. Dr. Smith says in his preface:

The present work aims to set before the public the history, as told by the participants and eye-witnesses themselves in all the unreserve of private correspondence, of the most momentous crisis in the annals of Europe. It is impossible here to appreciate the importance of the Reformation; I have done it, partially, elsewhere, and hope to return to it in the future. Suffice it to say that the revolution which goes by this name wrought an upheaval in the political, social, and religious structure of Europe and prepared the ground for our modern civilization. Every element of the movement is reflected in these letters: the return to the Bible, the revolt from ecclesiastical abuse and from papal authority, the economic and social reform, the growing nationalism and awakening subjectivism. (p. 6.)

All sides of this great movement of spiritual emancipation are set forth the more fully by adding to the letters of Luther, who is the storm center of it, the letters relating to him written by his contemporaries. Among them are Popes and Emperors, humanists and artists, and the great reformers Capito, Bucer, Æcolampadius, Zwingli and Melancthon. But the interest lies chiefly, nevertheless, in the subject of the letters himself, of whom Dr. Smith so well says:

The dominating personality in this work, as in the age, is Martin Luther. To many the chief valuation of the book will be the revelation of his inward life. His early spiritual struggles, the things by

which he profited and grew, his faith, his devotion to conscience and to truth as he saw it, and his indomitable will, stand out in his unconscious autobiography. No man in history has more thoroughly represented and more completely dominated his time, and these earliest years were the most beautiful in his life; a desperate battle and a momentous victory for progress and for right. There have been more faultless men than Luther, but there have been none who have fought harder for the good cause. Ours is an age that trusts life; that scorns a cloistered virtue, idle if stainless, but loves the warrior who rushes into the thick of the forces of evil to overthrow them, even if he is at times mistaken and now and then wrong. And in Luther we have the most active brain, the most intrepid will and the most passionate heart of his century. (pp. 6, 7.)

For the theologian also the book has some value, for by consulting the index, which is quite full, although one could wish it were even fuller in this respect, one can find many interesting statements of doctrine as held by the prominent men of that time, statements less guarded than those found in formal treatises on theology, and thence reflecting the more practical theological thought of the day. For instance, writing to John Staupitz on the subject of "penitence," Luther says:

Your words on this subject pierced me like the sharp arrows of the mighty, so that I began to see what the Scriptures had to say about penitence, and behold the happy result: the texts all supported and favored your doctrine, in so much that, while there had formerly been no word in almost all the Bible more bitter to me than "penitence" (although I zealously simulated it before God and tried to express an assumed and forced love), now no word sounds sweeter or more pleasant to me than that. For thus do the commands of God become sweet when we understand that they are not to be read in books only, but in the wounds of the sweetest Saviour.

After this it happened by the favor of the learned men who taught me Hebrew and Greek, that I learned that the Greek word is *metanoia* from *meta* and *noun*, i. e., from "afterwards" and "mind," so that penitence or *metanoia* is "coming to one's right mind, afterwards," that is, comprehension of your own evil, after you have accepted loss and found out your error. This is impossible without a change in your affections. (pp. 91, 92.)

This not only shows the working of Luther's mind on an important point in the doctrine of salvation, showing that it is neither by sacramental works nor by faith alone, but by an

actual change of motives, affections, and conduct; but it also shows how these theological reasonings led him to take issue with those who taught the doctrine of "indulgences" for the remission of sins, and so to become a leader of the Reformation. For he adds, "Sticking fast to this conclusion, I dared to think that they were wrong who attributed so much to works of repentance that they have left us nothing of it but formal penances and elaborate confession."

As we read on through this correspondence we are impressed more and more with the fact that the first Christian Church had reached its end, that, in the words of Melancthon, it had "very little true theology left, but if any one called attention to it he was dubbed a heretic and schismatic for his pains" (p. 216). The situation seems to be well described in a letter of Crotus Rubeanus to Luther, saying:

I tell you this, Martin, that you may understand how little it avails at Rome to say, "Thy testimonies, Lord, are wonderful, therefore doth my soul keep them." For they have got to such a degree of impiety that the words "good Christian" or "theologian" are epithets of extreme contempt, but it is esteemed great good fortune to obtain the title of chamberlain or butler to the Pope. The Pope holds the first place of honor, Christ the last. When the High Priest goes forth, as many cardinals, protonotaries, bishops, legates, provosts and attorneys follow him as hungry birds gather around carrion.

Wherefore, Martin, you do not conquer—although armed with the armor of Scripture and with the sword of the Holy Spirit you seek the life of the enemy—for the judgment of victory is with the Roman See, not with the Scripture, for, witness your friend Prierias, the very Bible gets its authority from the Pope. But your appeal to a general council saves you from this difficulty. The appeal itself is drawn up so carefully, according to Divine and human laws, that it deserves Praise even from enemies. (pp. 231, 232.)

But Luther did not trust to councils, and no appeals to them saved him. If it had not been the Lord who worked by means of those great reformers, there never would have been a Reformation and a preparation for His Second Coming. It is the spirit within such words of Luther's as the following that the Pope and the Councils could not withstand:

I gave and offered myself in the name of the Lord, whose will be done. . . . Let us in faithful prayer commit this human cause to God, and let us be at peace. What can they do? Kill? Can they raise up to kill again? Will they brand me as a heretic? Christ was condemned, with the wicked, seducers and cursed men; whenever I consider His passion, I burn to think that this trial of mine should not only seem to be something, but should even be considered great by many strong men, when in truth it is nothing, unless we would altogether do away with suffering and evil, that is, with the Christian life. (p. 275.)

H. C. H.

“JEHOVAH-JESUS.”*

THIS is the seventh volume in Charles Scribner's so-called “Short Course Series,” edited by Rev. John Adams, B.D. The series consists of small, handy volumes, of which nine have so far appeared.

“Jehovah-Jesus” seems designed to answer the question, why so many names are, in the Word, “heaped upon God the Father,” and to serve the further purpose of showing that whatever names in the Bible are worthy of God, apply equally to the Lord Jesus Christ.

The “Introduction” is the most helpful part in this little book, giving intelligent information on the meaning of the name *Jehovah* in the Old Testament. It treats of its Hebrew etymology; its pronunciation; tentatively of its meaning; the character of Jehovah as gleaned from the Old Testament books; and His works. It then passes to “the Jesus of the New Testament,” and finds strong grounds to regard Him as a real personage; reviews briefly His life, character, and teachings. From what has been adduced, wholly upon Scriptural basis, the author feels justified to postulate “The Identity of the Two.” To a New-Churchman the closing words of this presentation are very satisfactory and cheerful: “It is apparent that Jesus was not merely a man filled with God's spirit and ethically one with God, but was Jehovah Himself become incarnate, God manifest in the flesh.”

**Jehovah-Jesus*. BY REV. THOMAS WHITELAW, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1913. 144 pp., 12mo. 60 cents net.

I suspect that in the discussion of the various names (Jehovah-Jireh, Jehovah-Rophi, Jehovah-Nissi, Jehovah-Shalom, Jehovah-Tsidkenu, Jehovah-Shammah—to each of which a chapter is devoted) the author may have had the laudable aim to give to critically inclined students a more helpful view than that which dry lexicons supply. The attempt at etymological and historical accuracy is reasonably kept up in the chapters as they follow one another, though one feels that the line of study is getting of less and less importance as the book goes on.

It might almost be wished that the work had mainly supplied this sort of information, and left out all further considerations; for in the very first chapter (on Jehovah-Jireh) which deals with Abraham and his “faith” in getting ready to slay his son, the author finds nothing but the story of the vicarious sacrifice.

If Abraham was a type of the Old Testament saint and also of the New Testament believer, then as clearly Isaac prefigured the Church whose life was forfeit and under condemnation, and the ram the Lord Jesus Christ through whose substitution the Church has been delivered (p. 30) By faith Abraham went through his task; and “all things are still possible to him that believeth.”

The flavor of outworn doctrine that should not be resurrected in our day, continues more or less through the book, which resembles a collection of sermonettes.

One cannot help feeling a deep sympathy with another who, midst the difficulties of the twentieth century, and filled with a great loyalty, is struggling to preserve the traditional faith. The new age is absolutely against anything of mere tradition, but it is also without any clear foundation for the religiously inclined life within it. So it must be sometimes a really difficult road which the old faith has to traverse in these questioning times. The newer efforts at interpretation of Scripture scenes, where the literal accuracy and original meanings often are great helps that bridge over the chasm of long historical intervals, can often see very vividly the application of ancient situations to present-day circumstances. But sometimes the old dogmas are too deep-seated, and form

too dense a veil over the understanding, to allow a clearer light to shine into the inquiring mind.

It is quite interesting to see the symbolism which Abraham's sacrifice and the ram in the thicket suggest to the author. But if symbolism is admissible,—and every one surely will say it is,—then why not choose an interpretation of it that does not lead into that irrational, antiquated dogma of a vicarious atonement? Had the author a feeling of the anachronism of his superannuated dogmatic position in our age of rational thinking, when he said, "Both phenomena—Incarnation and Theophany—belong to the region of the supernatural, in which degrees of difficulty or of easiness are unknown"?—as if we men might ascribe any absurdity to the Divine, and then say, it is no absurdity in Him; for example, that the substitution of the innocent for the guilty in punishment, which is utterly irrational among men, is nothing irrational in the Divine, because nothing irrational is in Him. The contradiction is there, and any one (perhaps the author himself) feels that the interpretation of the symbolism is inadequate.

It was not too much to expect that an interpreter who is capable of using the original language would have seen in *Ab-ram*, *i. e.*, the exalted Father, a type of the Father, whom because of His attitude we call "our Father." With Him on earth as a real Being, how clearly it can be seen, that His struggle among human difficulties for a new, a better humanity (Isaac) was real, the whole problem of His whole life. His *mature* age only began to see the real issue—he was an old man when Isaac was born, and still more advanced when the sacrifice became fiercest. It was hard to part from Lot; harder to part from Ishmael, his own son—but hardest to part with Isaac, the son by his true wife. Here are struggles of a real man's real life—there is nothing vicarious all through this life—and yet how true of Jesus, the Saviour of men! His life was ever a strife, and as it went on the struggle rose fiercer and more cruel. He knew what was in man; and to show man the way rationally to the truest manhood, he saw that the weak and infirm, the selfish, human, must be

absolutely surrendered, if the true—as we sometimes call it, the ideal—manhood is to survive. It must needs seem to man, that the man himself must die if that nobler manhood is to live; because as natural earth-dwellers it seems as if the ideal was only for children, or the immature. The Lord showed the way—and He really had to surrender all of that life which made Him real among men. Only through the surrender of that which was finite, limited, in a word earthly-human, could He enter into His own proper, Divine life. The finite, the earthly, even man shares with the animals—the Best of men with the best of animals, the innocent sheep or lamb. The human which men saw was “the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world”—great as it was as man, it had to die so that the God-man could live. Isaac lived, and in him all the families of the earth should be blessed.

You can apply the story, of Abraham offering Isaac, to the church to follow the saving example of Jesus in laying down the life. It is the life which in the best sense lives only for this world, a life that is not concerned about vital principles that must die, in order that the measure of the real man, that is an angel, may be attained. Not an angel with painted wings in an imaginary world, but a good, pure, sweet soul, that would leave every place, every circumstance in which it met others, better, more enjoyable, more truly blissful than it found it. That is to give up the purely worldly and selfish life; the animal life must die that Isaac may live, that is, that the spiritual life of true manhood may live and become free.

There is in this picture nothing that has been changed, nothing but the interpretation. Yet what a difference! The interpretation has not led to any contradiction. It is an interpretation which will commend itself to children even. It is not asking a rational being to give up his reason. It does not destroy any living faith; and yet it opens up a helpful view of a life we all have to live. Whether this be precisely the interpretation which every one (even the author of “Jehovah-Jesus”) should accept, is of no consequence what-

ever. But it is of paramount importance to see Scripture or Scripture personages in a way that every one who will may see life and see it more abundantly. The effort seems to be in the heart of the compiler, but his manner can unfortunately be helpful only to a very few who as yet have not begun to feel the responsibility of individual rational thought. Surely, if religion and religious life is to become a growing factor in our complex twentieth century, it must be by growing in intelligence with the enormously expansive activity.

Not for its positive teaching can the book be recommended, but its evident spirit of serious earnestness will be useful to a peruser.

J. E. WERREN.

“THE ASSURANCE OF IMMORTALITY.” *

IN his recent study of the problem of immortality, Mr. H. E. Fosdick subdivides his theme into three parts: first, The Significance of Immortality; second, The Possibility of Immortality; third, The Assurance of Immortality. In the first part the values of the agnostic and materialistic views of life are discussed; but the conclusion is reached that the concept of immortality for man is more reasonable.

Coming to the question of the possibility of immortality, the author refers to leading men in the fields of Science, Psychology, Philosophy, and Medicine, who cherish hopes of immortality, thereby showing at least that these fields of human research have not disproved immortality. He shows that absurd conceptions and dogmas concerning the nature of immortality have led to the rejection of the belief in immortality on the part of many. The death of the visible part of man and the doctrine of evolution tend toward the denial of immortality; yet the author argues for the spiritual element in man, the soul in the body, and he quotes Professor Fiske, that “the materialistic assumption that the life of the soul ends with the life of the body, is perhaps the most colos-

**The Assurance of Immortality.* By HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. 141 pp., 12mo. \$1.00.

sal instance of baseless assumption that is known to the history of philosophy."

Taking up the physiological argument, he shows that the soul is not identical with its instrument, the brain, and that the mind is vastly superior in quality and properties to the physical constituents of brain and brain-cells. Mind uses brain; but brain is not identical with mind, nor does it create mind. This line of argument leads to the conclusion that the objections to the belief in immortality are inconclusive, and that the assurance of immortality rests on higher considerations than mere scientific investigations. Man passes out of sight at death; but there is no known fact that negatives the belief that life continues.

Taking up the considerations that give assurance of immortality, the author seeks positive proof of man's immortality. He is not convinced that Psychical Research gives any positive and reliable evidence proving immortality. He shows that the universe is not the result of chance, but manifests a rational order; all science is imbued with this faith. Applying this principle to the question of immortality, he argues that life on earth is incomplete; the very principle of evolution requires a further development for man; the goodness of God involves the promise and gift of immortality to man; faith in immortality is closely interwoven with faith in God. The spiritual seers are unanimous in affirming immortality; and Jesus, he says, "never stopped to argue, but took it for granted, as an immediate and unquestioned intuition."

This book makes a connected and logical argument against the materialistic conception of the universe, and in favor of the immortality of man; but it does not bring forward the real evidence that establishes it as a fact. The belief in immortality in the first place was not and is not based on theory and argument, but on well established fact made known through revelation. This fact was given through seers and prophets who were given direct evidence through personal contact with the persons and things in the other life. Our Lord gives the assurance of immortality

from personal and direct knowledge, not from theory and intuition. He gave to the disciples and others direct evidence and experience. Paul's vision is a notable example. These revelations have extended through the ages. The most notable evidence is that given through Swedenborg, who wrote concerning the other life "from things heard and seen." It seems remarkable, with the superabundance of direct evidence teaching and demonstrating immortality, that men of intelligence are satisfied with the uncertainties of unaided human reason, when the great hereafter has been fully revealed to the world, not through trance mediums, but through divinely commissioned men who have published their testimony to the world; which testimony gives the full assurance of the reality of the life after death.

JOHN WHITEHEAD.